

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, July 2, 1954)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Russell Cartwright Stroup, D. D., minister of the Georgetown Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, look with compassion upon these Thy servants, who hold in solemn trust the heritage and hopes of all the people in the land we love. Theirs are burdens too great to be borne save by Thy power. Theirs are problems too perplexing to solve save by Thy wisdom.

Grant, we beseech Thee, to each man strength for his day. Guide all in the way of truth by Thy holy spirit. Vouchsafe to them vision to perceive Thy purpose and the courage to obey Thy will, to the end that as they are blessed by Thee the Nation may be blessed through them. And to Thee we shall give the glory, world without end. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 2, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—
ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 3683) to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask leave of the Senate to be absent for 24 hours beginning at 3 o'clock this afternoon, to attend the funeral in New York of the wife of my long-time friend and intimate business partner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF
ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following a brief executive session and a quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business to act on the nominations on the Executive

Calendar which appear under the heading "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul Emmert Miller, of Minnesota, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board for the remainder of the term of 14 years from February 1, 1954.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMODITY CREDIT
CORPORATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Earl L. Butz, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Elbert Parr Tuttle, of Georgia, to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles Swann Prescott to be United States attorney for the western district of Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles Swann Prescott to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Marjorie A. Hershisser, Lake Odessa, Mich., in place of D. M. Gray, transferred.

Marvin D. Cole, Middleton, Mich., in place of P. A. Curtis, transferred.

Shirley E. McBean, Peck, Mich., in place of Lyman Woodward, retired.

Burnetta W. Lawitzke, Port Hope, Mich., in place of H. C. Bunting, retired.

MINNESOTA

Robert J. Talbert, Crystal Bay, Minn., in place of E. T. Swanson, deceased.

Vernon A. Temanson, Greenbush, Minn., in place of Andrew Lubinski, retired.

Ruby S. Lynch, South International Falls, Minn., in place of H. S. Ness, removed.

MISSOURI

Weldon P. Coy, South St. Joseph, Mo., in place of E. C. Buehler, retired.

NEBRASKA

Ivan E. Hiatt, Bristow, Nebr., in place of M. E. Andersen, retired.

William H. Weber, Creighton, Nebr., in place of W. A. Horstman, removed.

Duane M. Vannice, Halsey, Nebr., in place of L. F. Besley, retired.

Clarence O. Rodine, Polk, Nebr., in place of M. P. Westfall, retired.

NEVADA

Bettie J. Nurmi, Austin, Nev., in place of W. B. Collins, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Lester W. Schroeder, Franklin, N. J., in place of Elizabeth Massey, resigned.

Frank W. Murphy, Paterson, N. J., in place of D. B. Morgan, deceased.

NEW YORK

Leon P. Carey, Woodstock, N. Y., in place of Howard Bell, resigned.

OHIO

August J. Leagre, De Graff, Ohio, in place of P. D. Smith, removed.

Harry A. Tittsworth, Fremont, Ohio, in place of L. C. Brokate, resigned.

Earl W. Conner, Waynesville, Ohio, in place of L. H. Gordon, resigned.

OREGON

Albert M. Hodler, Portland, Oreg., in place of E. T. Hedlund, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Earl S. Cummings, Allquippa, Pa., in place of E. E. Hanna, resigned.

Bruce Crumm, Altoona, Pa., in place of P. V. Tillard, retired.

Kelvin L. Bowman, Klingerstown, Pa., in place of W. H. Davis, retired.

George W. Gunia, Springdale, Pa., in place of E. F. Kapteina, resigned.

William W. Davis, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in place of E. J. Quinn, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Robert A. Smith, Clinton, Tenn., in place of B. R. Vandergriff, resigned.

Francis M. Bray, Jellico, Tenn., in place of H. H. Hackney, removed.

TEXAS

John W. Veazey, Ben Wheeler, Tex., in place of L. L. Cates, retired.

Rupaco T. Gonzalez, Falcon Heights, Tex. Office established September 1, 1951.

VIRGINIA

R. Frazier Smith, Jr., Covington, Va., in place of T. B. McCaleb, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Wanda G. Wyatt, Union, Wash., in place of H. G. Andersen, retired.

WISCONSIN

William D. Arnold, Lake Nebagamon, Wis., in place of L. J. Drolson, transferred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Green	McCarran
Barrett	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hendrickson	Payne
Bowling	Hickenlooper	Reynolds
Butler	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Upton
Cordon	Knowland	Watkins
Crippa	Langer	Wiley
Ervin	Lehman	Williams
Flanders	Long	Young
George	Mansfield	
Gillette	Martin	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BURKE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GORE, Mr. HENNINGSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONROE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THYE, and Mr. WELKER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Routine business is now in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and cer-

tain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such suspensions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATION FOR "SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS"

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Support of United States Prisoners" for the fiscal year 1955 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 3601. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to extend until not later than October 18, 1962, certain timber rights and necessary ingress and egress, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2206).

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 3622. A bill to provide for the preparation of plans and specifications for a museum building for the Smithsonian Institution; with amendments (Rept. No. 2207).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 9804. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2205).

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3040. A bill to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project (Rept. No. 2209).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 3419. A bill to authorize a \$50 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation (Rept. No. 2210).

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TIN— REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 259) to provide for the Joint Committee on Tin, and I submit a report (No. 2208) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The report will be received, and, pursuant to the order of the Senate of July 29, 1954, the concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (by request):

S. 3831. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 3832. A bill for the relief of William Murray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3833. A bill for the relief of Julius Firt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the request of the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Thomas S. Gates, Jr., I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended. Mr. Gates forwarded the bill to the Senate by letter addressed to the President of the Senate, dated July 21, 1954, which I request be printed in full text in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The President of the Senate, Vice President Nixon, referred the matter to me as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It will be noted that Mr. Gates states that he has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense in regard to this proposed legislation.

In introducing this bill I wish to make it clear that I am doing so by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3831) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter referred to is as follows:

JULY 21, 1954.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954 and it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposal would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U. S. C. 201) to provide that its principal provisions shall not apply to employees whose services are performed in a foreign country or within United States territory other than a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, outer Continental Shelf lands, Guam, American Samoa, and Wake Island. With respect to Guam, American Samoa, and Wake Island, this proposal provides that the Secretary of Labor after a public hearing may determine the minimum wage appropriate for the geographical area or particular work performed, not in excess of the minimum rate applicable within the continental United States.

The proposal also provides that no employer shall be subject to any liability under the Fair Labor Standards Act or the Portal-to-Portal Act for work performed outside the areas named above, or for work performed on Guam, American Samoa, or Wake Island prior to the effective date of a minimum wage fixed by the Secretary of Labor.

The Fair Labor Standards Act covers employees engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce. The geographic coverage of the act turns upon the definition of "State" as "any State of the United States or the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States." As a result of this broad definition, the act may be interpreted as applicable not only to employees in the United States and its Territories but also to employees upon any United States base anywhere in the world.

This broad interpretation of coverage is supported by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Vermilya-Brown Co., Inc. v. Connell* (335 U. S. 377 (1948)). This case held that the Fair Labor Standards Act, if otherwise applicable, covered employees of United States contractors engaged in construction of a military base for the United States on land in Bermuda acquired from Great Britain under the destroyer-lease agreement. The Court held that the "facts indicate an intention on the part of Congress in its use of the word 'possession' to have the act apply to employer-employee relationships on foreign territory under lease for bases."

The full effect of the *Vermilya-Brown* decision was not immediately felt by the Department of Defense because the Department was not then engaged in a mobilization effort which involved extensive overseas construction in areas covered by this decision. However, the expansion of military operations at home and abroad since the Korean incident has precipitated serious

problems relating to the applicability of the Fair Labor Standards Act to the various overseas possessions.

The Fair Labor Standards Act imposes a minimum wage of 75 cents per hour and requires that overtime compensation at time and one-half for all hours worked beyond 40 in a workweek be paid to all employees covered by the act. On bases or establishments in foreign areas where the act may presently be held applicable and where native workers are utilized, labor standards for areas contiguous to the base or establishment are under the jurisdiction of foreign governments and are established at levels consistent with the prevailing local economy. Applying the conditions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to work performed within the base or establishment would require, in most instances, wage payments on the part of contractors performing work for the Department of Defense to be made at higher wage scales than those generally prevailing in the area. Such wage payments would obviously distort the local economy and, in some instances, objections have been received from foreign governments. In addition, such payments would result in higher costs to the United States.

With respect to areas, other than those designated in section 3 of the proposal, upon which the United States may have defense bases or other establishments, the proposal expressly provides that the minimum wage, overtime, recordkeeping, and child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act do not apply. With respect to Guam, American Samoa, and Wake Island, the proposal would authorize the Secretary of Labor to determine minimum-wage rates not in excess of the generally applicable minimum, now 75 cents per hour, taking into consideration the fact that the labor standards in these areas are unlike those in the United States. In addition, where such minimum-wage rates are established, the Secretary of Labor may make rules and regulations providing variations and exemptions from any of the provisions of section 7 (overtime payments) and section 12 (child labor) if he shall find that economic conditions warrant such action.

The principal problem now arises upon Guam, where Department of Defense contractors have been engaged in a major expansion program for improving defense facilities. There have not been sufficient local resident workers to accomplish this program. The remoteness of the island, its climate, and the more favorable economic conditions in the United States have prevented the attraction of sufficient United States workers, particularly in the laboring and semiskilled classifications. As a consequence, a large number of the required workers were recruited under contract from the Philippines. These workers had to be taught new skills and techniques, and their usefulness and productivity suffered from inability to understand English. They have been paid hourly wages and have been provided with lodging, board, and medical care. The compensation and the conditions of employment had the approval of the Philippine Government. The total of such compensation and benefits has been commensurate with their productive efficiency. Although for the less skilled workers the total compensation and benefits has not amounted to the 75-cent minimum prescribed by the Fair Labor Standards Act, the compensation has been substantial and has been much greater than they would have earned in the Philippines.

The Department of Defense believes that the employment of native workers in foreign areas as well as the employment of Filipinos on Guam has been advantageous to the workers and to their countries. The program has been administered fairly, with-

out exploitation, to produce substantial savings for the United States and to promote good international relations. To remove any technical doubt as to the legality of this employment, the Department of Defense proposes the exemptions from the Fair Labor Standards Act as set forth in the attached draft of legislation.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This proposal would forestall claims that could amount to several million dollars from foreign workers on defense bases who have been paid less than the 75-cent minimum wage. It will also make unnecessary increases in the wage scales for foreign workers on such bases to pay all employees who may be covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act not less than this minimum and to maintain established wage differentials above this minimum. These claims and these increased wages would be reflected in higher costs to the United States for its contract work. For example, if the Fair Labor Standards Act is enforced on Guam, the Department of Defense is faced with a potential cost of more than \$3 million for retroactive wage payments; in addition, annual costs would increase by a minimum of \$1,500,000, which figure would be greatly increased if existing wage differentials between occupational categories are maintained.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA"

Mr. JENNER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 103), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary an additional 20,000 copies of the hearings entitled "Communist Propaganda," held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3052) to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3052, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3052, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1954—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9366) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1954—AMENDMENT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 9366) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes, now pending on the Senate calendar. This substitute conveys, with some modification, the substance of a bill I introduced last year, S. 2260, for the improvement and liberalization of our social-security laws, and proceeds along the lines of the administration's bill except that it makes much more comprehensive changes in the present law. I ask that the amendment lie on the table, and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BRIG. GEN. HERBERT D. VOGEL TO BE MEMBER OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, August 9, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 412, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF C. CANBY BALDERSTON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, August 5, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of C. Canby Balderston, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the remainder of the term of 14 years from February 1, 1952,

to fill an existing vacancy. At the time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF IRA A. DIXON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, August 5, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Ira A. Dixon, of Indiana, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 4 years, expiring June 30, 1958, to fill an existing vacancy. At the time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

REVISION OF McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—RESOLUTION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on June 30 the Orleans County, N. Y., American Legion, in convention assembled, adopted a resolution favoring the revision and overhauling of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act, and urging the national organization of the American Legion to modify its position accordingly. A copy of this resolution was sent to me by the chairman of the Americanism Committee of the Orleans County American Legion, William H. Murray.

It is a very detailed resolution reflecting much thought and considerable study on the part of those who drafted the resolution and considered the matter. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, reflecting a forward-looking attitude on the part of the Legionnaires and of the Legion posts situated in Orleans County, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF ORLEANS COUNTY AMERICAN LEGION, JUNE 30, 1954

UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION STATUTE

Whereas our United States immigration statute, Public Law 414, 82d Congress, commonly referred to as the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, is not in keeping with our traditions of fair play, decency, and justice for all; and

Whereas the quota system of Public Law 414 is based on the 1920 National Census population total less our Negro and American Indian citizens; and

Whereas Public Law 414 clearly discriminates against nationals of the southern European countries; and

Whereas consuls are charged with and hold the power of decision as to whether or not a visa shall be issued to an alien; and although there are no adequate or well defined standards on which to base these decisions, there is, nevertheless, no appeal from these decisions; and

Whereas naturalized citizens are placed in a second-class status in that they may be deported for an act which at the time of commission was not a crime and is not now a crime for native born citizens; and

Whereas the deportation of aliens, who may have been residents of this country for many years and may have established homes and reared families, work unduly severe hardships even though the grounds for the deportation may be based, may have occurred 30, 40, 50, or more years ago, there being no statute of limitations; and

Whereas no court review is permitted of the decision of the United States Attorney General to deport an alien; and

Whereas unduly severe and detailed procedures are required by Public Law 414 for alien professional and scientific workers seeking visas with the result that our country is to a large extent losing the valuable contributions which these people offer; and

Whereas Senator IRVING Ives holds that Public Law 414 is "contrary to the American creed," and he has "joined" with colleagues in the Senate and House in sponsoring a bill which would rewrite the present statute; and

Whereas Senator HERBERT LEHMAN views the present immigration statute as dangerous and un-American, and he has joined with 7 of his fellow Senators and 24 Members of the House in introducing a bill to rewrite the present statute; and

Whereas by resolution the national executive committee of the American Legion meeting in October of 1952 urged that "an adequate trial period be given the McCarran-Walter Act," which became effective on December 24, 1952; and

Whereas the American Legion's National Executive Committee, at their April-May 1953 meeting which was less than 5 months after the new immigration law became effective resolved "that the American Legion opposes any and all attempts being made to repeal in toto, or to materially weaken, destroy, or amend Public Law 414, 82d Congress, and that all necessary steps be taken to defeat any bills now pending, or that may hereafter be introduced in the Congress for said purposes." Thus the national executive committee accepted Public Law 414 as perfection and acceptable for all time; and

Whereas grave injustices have become apparent in the statute and its administration; and

Whereas President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message of January 1953, said of the immigration statute, "Existing legislation contains injustices. It does in fact discriminate. I am informed by Members of the Congress that it was realized, at the time of its enactment, that future study of the basis of determining quotas would be necessary." The President cited 10 specific provisions of the law "which it is claimed may operate with unwarranted harshness" in a letter to Senator ARTHUR WATKINS, chairman of the Congressional Joint Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and the President recommended that an immediate study be made with full and open hearings held to afford all those interested to be heard; and

Whereas Public Law 414 contains provisions which permit aliens who were and are believers in nazism and fascism to enter the United States; and

Whereas Public Law 414 furnishes the Communists with a great deal of propaganda material and causes the United States to look absurd to the rest of the world when it claims to be, on the one hand, a democratic peace-loving nation, with justice for all and on the other hand it enacts discriminatory legislation containing severe injustices; and

Whereas the American Legion's support of Public Law 414 is inconsistent with the Legion's general program, its avowed esteem for fair play, and its moral purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Orleans County American Legion, in convention assembled at the James P. Clark Post, No. 204, Medina, N. Y., on June 24, 1954, proclaims itself to favor legislation which would rewrite Public Law

414, the 82d Congress, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, to the end that the injustices and discrimination contained therein would be removed; and be it further

Resolved, That the national organization of the American Legion is hereby petitioned and urgently requested to recede from its stand of being in opposition to any, or material, changes in the present immigration statute; and that the national organization desist from issuing further press releases stating that the Legion is opposed to any change in the statute; and that the national commander is petitioned and requested to appoint a committee to make an immediate and full study of the immigration problem in order that a report might be available during the early part of the 1st session of the 84th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the eighth New York district and the department of New York is hereby petitioned to use every honorable means to effectuate the purposes of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the eighth district, the department of New York, to the national commander, to Senators IRVING IVEY and HERBERT LEHMAN, and to Congressman HAROLD C. OSTERTAG.

The above resolution was duly adopted by Orleans County American Legion at its annual convention held June 24, 1954, at the James P. Clark Post, No. 204, Medina, N. Y.

CLYDE C. DILLON,
Orleans County Commander.
EVERETT CADDY,
Orleans County Adjutant, the American Legion.

SENATORS' DILEMMA IN THE McCARTHY DISPUTE—ARTICLE BY JAMES RESTON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article published today in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DILEMMA IN POLITICS—SENATORS HAVE ONE EYE FOR PRINCIPLES, ANOTHER FOR VOTERS IN McCARTHY DISPUTE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 2.—The debate in the Senate on Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY has proved one thing: that the Wisconsinite is still a very influential man in the United States Senate.

The polls may be right in suggesting that Senator McCARTHY lost support during the televised Army hearings, but he still has working for him one rule of politics, which all politicians hesitate to break.

That is that a politician never antagonizes any group of voters in an election year—if he can avoid it.

Last week many Senators on both sides of the aisle were trying to avoid a vote on the resolution to censure Senator McCARTHY's actions on the ground that the resolution lacked a bill of particulars.

Now the generalized Flanders resolution has been amended by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT so that it has a most specific bill of particulars against the Senator from Wisconsin.

But many Senators are still hoping to find ways and means of avoiding a direct vote on the issue.

And though the question has been sent to a special committee for study, it is still not certain that the Senators will have to commit themselves before the Congress adjourns for the summer recess.

If the bipartisan committee, to which the censure motion has been referred, does force

the Senate to make a decision before adjournment, the chances still are that it will choose to vote for McCARTHY rather than against him.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND of California, the leader of the Senate Republicans, would rather take a chance on antagonizing the anti-McCarthy Senators than the pro-McCarthy. Anti-McCarthy Republicans such as Senator RALPH FLANDERS, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine; and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky; might forgive the majority leader for forsaking them, but the pro-McCarthy bloc would never forgive or forget.

Perhaps the most significant and certainly the boldest speech of the debate was made by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois. It was significant because he is the chairman of the Senate Republican campaign committee, charged with responsibility for helping the Republican Senators up for election in November, and he seemed more than willing to make defense of Senator McCARTHY a major campaign issue.

Unlike many of his colleagues, he did not try to evade the vote. He was cocky. He demanded a vote on the censure motion. He challenged the Democrats to vote against Senator McCARTHY. He taunted and goaded the liberals, roundly condemning the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Americans for Democratic Action, and even a most distinguished group of liberal Republicans who had called on the Senate to vote for the censure resolution.

The Senator from Illinois even produced a biblical text for his defense of the Wisconsin Senator: "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." His point was that since the Communist Party, the Daily Worker, and a host of liberal groups were for censuring Senator McCARTHY, all decent folk should be against such a resolution.

Senator DIRKSEN said he had heard this quotation in an invocation at the 1952 Republican National Convention, delivered by a very eminent rabbi. "Let us remember what the equities and the verities are," said the Illinois Senator: "Follow not a multitude to do evil."

THE BEST OF THE QUOTATION

This biblical theme seems to have impressed the orators, particularly on the Republican side. Senator HERMAN WELKER, of Idaho, picked it up again today and kept throwing it at the Democrats, but nobody apparently looked up what Senator DIRKSEN's very eminent rabbi really said in Chicago.

The invocation that impressed Senator DIRKSEN in that convention was made by Rabbi Louis L. Mann of the Sinai Temple of Chicago. He said several things that Senator DIRKSEN omitted.

"May freedom of assembly," he said, "not sink into the depths of mob action, but be utilized for high and noble purposes. Recalling the words of our Scriptures, 'thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil.'"

"We thank Thee for the gift of righteous indignation, and we are humbled, aye humiliated, by the crime, corruption, the dishonesty and faithlessness of those who have brought shame to our country. . . ."

"We pray:

"God give us men! A time like this demands Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog

In public duty and in private thinking.
God, give us men."

"Amen."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief announcement to the Senate relative to the legislative program on which I hope the Senate will be able to work during the coming week or 8 days.

After the morning hour has been concluded, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, which is Calendar No. 1831, H. R. 9678, the foreign aid authorization bill. I hope the Senate will be able to complete its work on that bill within a reasonable time today. There are only a few pending amendments remaining. We have disposed of a number of them so far. Therefore it is my hope that we may be able to complete our work on that bill some time this afternoon.

I shall then move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill, in the hope that we can complete work on that bill this evening. When consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill has been concluded, it shall be my purpose to make the farm bill the unfinished business of the Senate.

The Senate would then consider the farm bill beginning on Wednesday, when the Senate convenes on that day. I may say we expect to convene at 10 o'clock in the morning each day of this week. I am sure Senators recognize the fact that I can only make an estimate, but I assume consideration of the farm bill will take approximately 3 days—3 rather full days, to be sure. I hope the Senate may be able to complete its consideration of the Senate version of the farm bill within 3 days, which would bring us to Friday of this week.

On Saturday it will be my intention, after the Senate convenes at 10 o'clock in the morning, to have a call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection. I believe the call of the calendar will take all of Saturday. We would not want to hold a late session on Saturday evening.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I can assure the distinguished majority leader that the call of the calendar will occupy a full day.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure it will. Therefore the Senators on both calendar committees will be on notice, as will Senators who have interest in bills on the calendar. The call will be from the beginning of the calendar. In that way we will clear the decks, so to speak, and we will know what is left on the calendar for further consideration.

On Monday we expect to take up the anti-Communist bills, including Calendar No. 1720, S. 3706, to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, to provide for the determination of the identity of certain Communist-infiltrated organizations, and for other purposes; Calendar No. 1834, S. 3428, to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; Calendar No. 1833, H. R. 9580,

to revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage, and for other purposes.

The anti-Communist bills will be followed by the consideration of the social-security legislation. By that time I expect the foreign-aid appropriation bill will be ready for Senate action.

By that time, also, the Senate will be ready to take action on conference reports, which are privileged matters, and can be taken up during the course of the legislative program I have announced.

I have also previously announced that the Senate will take action on a number of other bills, not of such priority importance, perhaps, as the bills to which I have referred, but nevertheless of considerable importance. We expect to consider those bills also.

However, for the immediate future, I have stated the list of major measures which I hope the Senate will be able to dispose of during the next week or 8 days.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How long does the distinguished Senator plan to have the Senate stay in session tonight?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In order to complete action on both the foreign-aid bill and on the supplemental appropriation bill, so that we can take up the farm bill tomorrow, I expect the Senate to remain in session until 10 o'clock tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I note that the majority leader has scheduled the supplemental appropriation bill prior to the farm bill. I want to make it abundantly clear that the minority has been ready for some time to proceed with the farm bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So has the majority leader, but we have had a few intervening problems to dispose of. I hope we may be able to dispose of the supplemental appropriation bill by this evening. If so, we will be able to begin consideration of the farm bill tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The scheduling of the supplemental appropriation bill ahead of the farm bill, while it is not displeasing to the minority, but agreeable, if it is the desire of the majority leader to do so, I assume is not being done because of any desire to postpone consideration of the farm bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I assume full responsibility for that. It is being done in accordance with the custom and usual procedure of the Senate, and in keeping with the rules, to give appropriation bills priority consideration.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I did not hear the distinguished majority leader mention the omnibus navigation and flood-control bill, which is on the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Florida that there are quite a number of bills of importance which I did not mention. I did not mean the list I gave to be all-inclusive. I was merely trying to give a week's preview of proposed legislation which the Senate would handle on a priority basis. I am not un-

mindful of the fact that the Public Works Committee has reported the bill to which the Senator from Florida has referred. There have also been reported to the Senate an unemployment insurance bill, a school construction bill, and quite a number of other bills which have been previously mentioned. I was not trying to give an all-inclusive list. All I was trying to do was to give Senators an idea of the legislative program for the next week or 8 days, and the order in which bills would be called up.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from California will yield further, as I understand, the majority leader does expect to give the Senate a chance to pass upon the omnibus navigation and flood-control bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Florida that although the bill to which he refers has not been scheduled for action by the policy committee, it will be very difficult to know how much proposed legislation will be disposed of on the call of the calendar and how much will be left over after the call of the calendar. I have some doubt that the bill to which the Senator has referred will be passed on the call of the calendar, although it might be passed. However, until we know what has been disposed of on the call of the calendar on Saturday, it will be very difficult to tell about the remaining legislative measures. I expect by Monday of next week to be able to make a further announcement to the Senate with respect to the remaining legislative program, depending on the progress we make on the measures I have listed. I recognize that the bill referred to by the Senator from Florida is an important piece of proposed legislation which is worthy of consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, with reference to the omnibus public works bill, to which the Senator from Florida has referred, if we should be able to dispose of the bills on the calendar with reasonable dispatch, perhaps the majority leader could move to take up the omnibus navigation and flood-control bill following the call of the calendar on Saturday, because there is intense interest in that bill. I know of no deep opposition to it. It may require some discussion, but not prolonged discussion. I wonder whether the majority leader would bear that in mind in consulting with the policy committee, and perhaps we could work it out in that way.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall do that. Looking over the calendar, I think probably the calendar will occupy most of Saturday. It is a fairly long calendar now, and much has accumulated on it. In any event, I assume the public works bill will not require prolonged discussion. Whether it is scheduled for Saturday or the following week, we shall certainly give every consideration to it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. If consideration of the appropriation bill is concluded by 4:30 this afternoon, is it the intention of the

majority leader to call up the farm bill and immediately proceed with it, or call it up and then lay it aside?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Pursuant to my statement to the Senate, not only last night but on prior occasions, as soon as we have finished the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill, we will proceed immediately to the consideration of the farm bill. I hope we may be able to open debate on it immediately. If we should finish the foreign-aid bill and the supplemental appropriation in the afternoon or early evening, I hope we will move along as far as we can in the voting on any amendments offered to the farm bill, and stay with that bill until we have completed it. It will not be laid aside for any other measures. We may consider conference reports which will not take a prolonged period of time, but I certainly shall not expect to lay the farm bill aside until we have disposed of it, because undoubtedly it must go to conference. I think the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] has indicated that he thinks the conferees will need from 3 to 5 days in conference.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am desirous of getting it to conference as rapidly as possible.

Mr. AIKEN. Then it is entirely possible that we may put in several hours' work on the farm bill before 10 o'clock tonight.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am prayerfully hoping that our schedule will run along so as to permit that to be done.

Mr. AIKEN. I am hopeful the discussion on the farm bill will not occupy several days. In fact, I do not know of any long speeches which have been prepared by those who favor flexible supports.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Undoubtedly there will be a number of yea-and-nay votes, which of course require some time. Nevertheless, I am hopeful we can expedite the passage of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I should be surprised if it were necessary to spend from 3 to 5 days in conference. I believe we shall find very quickly whether or not the House and Senate conferees are to agree on the proposed legislation. I believe that it would be futile to drag out the conference for several days if it should become apparent at the start that agreement was not possible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the majority leader has been a little conservative in his estimate of 3 days' time for consideration of the bill on the floor and from 3 to 5 days in conference. I am a little gun shy now in making predictions, so I would rather estimate a little extra time than to shorten it too much.

Mr. AIKEN. I can well understand that.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I hope the Senator from Vermont did not mean to imply that the Senate conferees should say to the House conferees, "Take our bill or

leave it." I believe there is room for compromise on both sides.

Mr. AIKEN. There certainly is, because there are several imperfections in the House bill which should be corrected, either on the floor of the Senate or in conference. I think the House Members themselves realize that there must be some modifications of certain provisions.

Mr. YOUNG. We ourselves will probably have plenty of amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is always a little give and take in such conferences.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Can the Senator suggest when he believes the Senate may vote on the foreign-aid bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have high hope that we may be able to dispose of the foreign-aid bill by midafternoon.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further morning business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Goldwater	McClellan
Bennett	Gore	Monroney
Bowring	Green	Payne
Burke	Hendrickson	Purtell
Bush	Holland	Reynolds
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Sparkman
Ervin	Langer	Thye
Ferguson	Lehman	Welker
Flanders	Lennon	Wiley
Frear	Long	Williams
George	Mansfield	
Gillette	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms is instructed to execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORDON, Mr. CRIPPA, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHN-

SON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, designated "7-28-54-E."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 168, after line 21, it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

Sec. 547. Reduction of authorizations: Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this act, such provisions shall not be construed to authorize the appropriation, for the purposes of titles I, II, and IV of this act, of amounts (exclusive of unexpended balances of prior appropriations authorized to be continued available under such provisions) aggregating in excess of \$2,066,000,000.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I regret that it was necessary for me to insist that a quorum be called before I called up my amendment. However, it does seem to me we owe the country the responsibility of careful accounting for the money of the taxpayers that is to be expended under the bill.

The bill would authorize the expenditure of \$12,849,000,000. I say that because the bill is necessary in order to authorize the expenditure of funds that have already been appropriated. In addition, the bill is necessary to authorize another \$3,100,000,000 of expenditures.

I regret that although I have made every effort to have a quorum of Senators present on the floor, I do not see more than 30 Senators present. The fact is that there are committee meetings in progress, and Senators feel that they have certain responsibilities toward those committees. They want to do their best to discharge those responsibilities, and they feel other Senators can inform them as to what is going on on the floor of the Senate in the course of the debate.

This is an example of the loose accounting of the taxpayers' money. I say that because at the very moment we are discussing how much of the \$13 billion we should spend, the Appropriations Committee is already marking up the bill as to how much money should be appropriated even before the appropriation is authorized.

The House of Representatives has already passed the appropriation bill, with a reduction of only about \$100 million or \$150 million from the authorizations provided in this bill; and that has been done before the Congress has even authorized the expenditure of the funds.

Mr. President, the amendment I have offered proposes that there be a reduc-

tion of one-third of the new money in this fund, but that will be a reduction of only about 7.2 percent of the money which would be on hand when this money is appropriated.

I believe that Senators do not realize, however, that the maximum amount the foreign-aid administrators have been able to spend is only about \$5 billion in 1 year. With this appropriation, they will have on hand \$12,849,000,000, or enough money to carry the program, at the maximum rate at which they have been able to spend American money overseas, for another 2 years and 3 months.

Would not it be fine if those who are interested in the development of the resources of this Nation could have their money on hand 2½ years ahead of time? Would it not be a fine thing if those who are interested in flood control, navigation, soil conservation, rural electrification, and housing in the United States could have on hand enough money to carry them 2½ years, even if Congress did not appropriate another 5 cents?

But if we were to reach that situation in regard to our own resources, Senators would rise on this floor and say that it was an outrageous thing, and that it was wasteful of public funds, to pile money on top of money, 2½ years in advance of the time when the money would be spent. Senators would say that, instead, year by year we should establish that each one of the items was necessary.

By contrast, our Foreign Relations Committee and our Appropriations Committee rapidly approve the newly recommended expenditures, and recommend the passage of these money bills, far in advance of the time that the money is needed.

I was impressed by the economies made in the military budget of the new administration. In studying them, having previously served on the Armed Services Committee, I was most impressed by the fact that the greatest reductions in proposed appropriations arose from discoveries by the new administration that the previous administration had been piling billions of dollars on top of the billions of dollars left on hand from previous years—billions of dollars that the armed services could not possibly spend during the next 2, 3, or even 4 years in some instances.

Having been chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Bases, I noticed the Armed Forces had had money on hand more than 3 years in advance of the time when it was needed for expenditure in developing many of the military bases. The same situation exists with regard to the funds we now have under consideration.

What I am proposing is that we require those in charge of this program to go back over the program and study it to see where reductions can be made in the proposed \$12,849,500,000 worth of expenditures.

Last year I was on the floor, urging that we reduce this foreign, overseas giveaway program. I admit that much of it is a good giveaway program; much of it is in the interest of our Nation.

But I was urging that we reduce the program by \$500 million of the new money which was authorized in that connection. My amendment did not prevail, although I am pleased to say that a majority of the Republican Senators did vote for the amendment, and a goodly number of Democratic Senators also voted for it. The amendment failed by only a very small margin.

Mr. President, if my motion had prevailed last year, this year we would find that the Foreign Operations Administration would have on hand only \$9,249,500,000 of unspent appropriations—only enough to carry the program for another 2 years. As it is, thanks to the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Foreign Operations Administration has on hand the great sum of \$9,749,500,000 of appropriations which have not been spent.

The previous year I also urged that we reduce some of the money that was being provided; I did so in the hope that we might get a better accounting of the taxpayers' funds. Once again I was unsuccessful, except I did succeed in shaving off a mere \$100,000,000. As a result, at the end of that fiscal year, and at the time when the corresponding bill was debated last year, we at that time had on hand, appropriated and unexpended, according to the Foreign Relations Committee, balances of \$10,061,000,000—only enough to carry on the program for a little more than 2 years with the money then on hand.

Mr. President, anyone who wishes to go overseas and see what happens to this money will find that this is the most loosely handled of any of the taxpayers' money, under any program of our Government. Let me state the reason why that is so. This money cannot be spent until some sort of agreement is reached with the foreign countries concerned. When Congress proceeded to appropriate the money in terms of lumps of \$5 billion, or \$4,500,000,000, at a time, our foreign administrators were not immediately able to obtain the agreements with the other countries they wanted for military aid.

In some instances they were not able to arrive at agreements for a long time. But that did not keep our administrators from coming back and requesting Congress for a second year's installment, although the first year's installment was still on hand. That made the overseas administrators feel that they should try to make up for lost time. The result was that they had on hand twice as much money as they could spend in that year.

What was the result in the foreign countries? Those administering the program felt they had a directive of Congress to find some way to spend the money in the foreign countries, although they had on hand twice as much money as they felt they could dispose of in 1 year. The result was that some of them were almost pleading that the foreign countries should accept the money. That is not a good way to give away money. If we propose to give away money, we should encourage those who

will receive it to believe they are as much interested in the program as are those who are spending the money.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that Sweden sent back to the United States \$20 million, and would not even accept it?

Mr. LONG. That is correct; and in instance after instance a foreign country has simply told us it was not interested in the program we had to offer, based upon the terms we were offering that country.

I had occasion to look at many of the instances in which foreign countries felt they were actually doing us a favor by taking our money and taking our arms. I once discussed this matter with an Englishman. I was discouraged to find how little this friend of mine was interested in the amount of foreign aid we were making available to his country. Finally I asked him, "If the worst comes, we Americans will save our country. The question in my mind is whether you Englishmen are interested in saving your country, because if you are not, from my point of view I am no more interested in saving you than you are interested in saving the liberty and freedom and sovereignty of your own nation." Oddly enough, he had never thought of it from that point of view, and it was rather strange to him to hear an American speak that way.

Mr. President, in the administration there are those who are interested in economy. But they get very little encouragement; and when they talk to representatives of foreign nations, the unfortunate thing about the program is that those representatives of foreign nations know that all they have to do is obtain a recommendation from the Foreign Operations Administration for additional funds, and then Congress will grant the funds. In some instances Congress will grant the funds even when they cannot be justified, and when the need for the funds cannot be fairly established.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. REYNOLDS. How does the Senator from Louisiana arrive at the proposed \$1 billion reduction called for by his amendment, which is one-third of the additional \$3 billion? Why does not the Senator provide in his amendment for eliminating the entire \$3 billion?

Mr. LONG. Frankly, I believe there is enough money without the \$3 billion. Certainly there is enough money on hand to carry on the program for 2 years, even if we were not to appropriate an additional 5 cents. That could be done simply by reprogramming some of the funds already on hand. However, as a practical matter, having tried to reduce this appropriation on the floor year in and year out, I am optimistic only to the extent of approximately \$1,033,000,000;

and when we come to vote on the amendment, the Senator from Nebraska will find that even that reduction will be a very difficult one to make.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. LONG. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that only a few days ago we tried to get rid of the entire \$3 billion, but we were voted down? So now we are trying to do the next best thing, by making a reduction of approximately \$1,033,000,000.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I believe that there is merit to this program. I believe that we should help our allies to arm themselves and be prepared. But I submit to the Senators that no program financed with American tax money is more wasteful than the program we are discussing. One reason is that this program is out from under the scrutiny of the average Senator and the average Member of the House of Representatives. If there is waste in expenditures for programs in this country it comes to the attention of Senators and Representatives more readily than does waste in our overseas program.

Let me give an indication of how loosely some of this money is being proposed to be expended. On page 255 and page 256 of the hearings Senators will find a discussion of Indochina. To the best of my understanding, in that area approximately \$450 million worth of military equipment is stacked on the docksides still in crates in addition to billions of dollars of American money already spent in arming and paying the French and Vietnamese.

As Senators know the war in Indochina is over; a truce has been signed; and it has been agreed that there will be free elections in Indochina to see whether Vietnam goes Communist or whether the country is going to be free.

I regret to say that every American expert with whom I have discussed the matter has presumed that those elections will be lost to the Communists, and that all the billions of dollars worth of equipment we have sent to Indochina will go behind the Iron Curtain.

Nevertheless, there is more than \$450 million of military equipment on the docksides available to anyone in Indochina who would like to fight for the free world. Of course, the difficulty is that the people there do not seem to have the heart to fight with the free world on the democratic side of this issue.

In addition to that, it is my best understanding that between \$600 million and \$755 million of additional money are in the pipeline. That money was committed to the Indochina theater at a time when a "hot" war was being fought there. Yet this bill fails to reveal that any consideration at all has been given to the fact that at a time when we are appropriating money at the rate of \$800 million for Indochina to fight a "hot" war, there is no "hot" war. As a result

of the election to be held, there is serious danger that the Communists will win, and that the whole \$600 million already appropriated, plus the \$450 million of equipment will fall into the hands of our enemies rather than of our friends.

As though that were not bad enough, Mr. President, this bill contains another \$800 million for Indochina, in addition to the \$600 million in the pipeline, and the \$450 million worth of equipment already there, representing a grand total of far more than \$1 billion. The amount in this bill is about \$1,400,000 for a war that is no longer being waged, in an area where free elections are to be held, which, we are told, will probably result in the Ho Chi Minh forces winning rather than the free world winning. Yet according to this bill and report we are to pour another \$1,400,000,000 into that area.

Certainly that situation should be restudied. The committee should have said that we ought to hold up and see what is going to happen in Indochina before we send another \$800 million or another \$1,400,000,000 of additional equipment to Indochina.

Mr. President, Senators may say, "There is some flexibility in this program, and the money need not be sent to Indochina; some replanning can be done." But I will tell you that, with regard to the so-called replanning program of the proposed expenditures, the money for the other countries has already been provided for years in advance.

For example, let us look at the situation that exists in Europe. To countries in Europe we have already given away \$17 billion worth of arms and equipment, in addition to what those countries can do for themselves.

For Europe there is on hand unexpended, \$5,683,100,000, \$2,527,000,000 of which is uncommitted and unobligated.

Senators may ask why we have such an enormous amount of money, \$2,527,000,000, unobligated in the European phase of the program. I suspect that the reason we have so much uncommitted and unobligated in Europe is that we hope that one of these days the European Defense Community proposal will be ratified, and our administrators would like to have on hand billions of dollars appropriated, unexpended, and unobligated, which they could use for arming the Germans.

Mr. President, \$2,527,000,000 certainly is enough to have ahead of time in the event that program is ratified. We have no reason to believe that the EDC is going to be ratified, and we have no reason to believe that the Germans are going to insist on being or are even willing to be rearmed in the event that program is ratified.

I recall very well when the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the late Senator Taft, made a great argument on the floor of the Senate against this whole program. At that time he argued that it was a mistake for us to take the attitude that we were more interested in preserving the sovereignty and freedom of any nation than that nation was in fighting for and preserving its own free-

dom and its own sovereignty. He said that the initiative for this program should come from the other countries; that they should be the ones to request this assistance from us rather than we being the ones to ask them to take our arms and our equipment. He said we would get much better results for our expenditures in that way. I have always been impressed by the fact that the late Senator from Ohio was right in his argument that we should show no more zeal in saving others than they show in saving themselves.

We have on hand \$5,683,000,000 for European countries. Would it not be a good idea for us to insist on knowing what is going to happen to the EDC before we proceed to pile a third or fourth year's increment on top of the enormous amount of funds already available?

I point out to Senators that in addition to the \$5,683,000,000 unexpended for military aid, there is another \$360 million for military defense support. That is the kind of appropriation the Europeans most like, because that means jobs and employment are provided in their factories, producing equipment by their efforts, but paid for at the expense of the American taxpayers.

This bill provides another \$900 million in addition to the \$6 billion already on hand for Europe, and in addition to the \$17 billion we have already given them.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that when no war is going on the equipment given to a foreign country is not used up or destroyed as in the case of war. Last year's rifle is just as good as this year's rifle. It is still a Garand rifle, and if it is properly maintained and properly kept and properly oiled and greased, it is just as good a rifle the second year as it was the first year. Rifles, tanks, airplanes, ships, and guns last for many, many years, and shells and mortars are still on hand; there is still left the \$17 billion we have given them already, in addition to the roughly \$6 billion on hand.

Mr. President, when this program was originally started we were told that the year 1954 was the year of greatest peril. We were told that this was the year in which we could expect the Russians to start a war, if they were going to start it, and we were told that we should build toward the year 1954.

We had about 5 years to do that. We have appropriated the amount of money this program originally contemplated when it was first put into effect, and we have roughly \$6 billion of that money still on hand.

In the opinion of the junior Senator from Louisiana, reducing this authorization \$1 billion will not prevent our allies from receiving 1 gun, 1 airplane, 1 knapsack that those nations have any need of during the next year.

There is flexibility in the program, so that the President can shift aid from one area to another. The committee's own report states that at the end of this fiscal year it is expected that \$7,368,800,000 will be on hand. That will be next year in 1955, when Congress will be in session.

If Senators wish to give all this money away, why give it away 2 years in advance? Why not wait until next year? We do not have to give it all away now. We shall be in session in January. Presumably in January there will have been spent only half of the \$5½ billion which could be given away during the next fiscal year. We would have on hand at that time approximately \$10 billion.

If we find at that time that we are not giving away our arms and equipment to our friends and allies fast enough, we can step up the expenditures and appropriations next year.

Therefore, it would be well for us to demand that a more careful accounting be made of this program, and that there be done with this program what was done with our own military program.

One of the most commendable actions taken by the Eisenhower administration was in January, when the Secretary of Defense, Charles Wilson, went over the whole program with respect to military bases. He had before him a request for \$4 billion. After studying the matter, he found he had enough money on hand to carry the program for another 2 years without the necessity of requesting new appropriations for military bases.

Thereupon he refused the request.

Likewise, he studied the plans for airplane procurement. As a result of his study, he found he had enough orders on hand and enough money on hand for airplane procurement to carry the program for another 4 or 5 years. He withdrew his request for additional appropriations. In other words, he found he had sufficient money on hand to carry that program for a long time, and he therefore withdrew his request for additional funds.

Mr. President, we have enough money on hand to carry the foreign aid program for another 2 years. Of course, some Senators will say there is another reason why we should hand out money 2 or 3 years in advance of its need.

They will say that long lead times are required to produce some of these weapons. That is not true with respect to the kind of weapons we are giving away under this program. We are not giving away our latest model jet airplanes. We are giving away the older-type equipment. We are not giving away our fastest and most modern high-climbing aircraft.

We are giving away our older equipment, for use in areas of the world where an older product is just as useful and effective for the type of local actions anticipated.

If the Foreign Operations Administration wants to have more goods on order, I point out that there is \$2 billion worth of waste or "fat" in the Army's budget. That money could be used by simply switching that program of procurement to foreign aid, when the need is established.

There is approximately \$2 billion worth of "fat" or unnecessary funds in the Army budget. That could be used for foreign aid by placing some of the

orders for tanks, for example, and simply transferring the equipment to foreign aid at a later date.

The orders could be placed, and it would be a simple matter to shift the money to foreign aid operations.

On July 9 I placed in the *RECORD* an article published in the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald* of June 21, 1954. It is entitled "Army Gets \$2 Billion Extra To Alleviate Fears." It was written by John W. Finney. The article is printed at page 10165 of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* of July 9. It reads:

A Defense Department official has told Senators that \$2 billion in "fat" was left in the Army budget to allay public fears that America's ground forces were being cut too hard.

Lyle S. Garlock of the defense comptroller's office made the statement to members of the Senate Appropriations Committee recently in secret hearings on the administration's \$29 billion defense budget. The bill was approved by the Senate Thursday.

Garlock said the \$2 billion was appropriated in past years for Army procurement and production. It will not be used by the Army in fiscal 1955, but was left in the budget for public psychology, he said.

The administration's defense budget for the 12 months beginning July 1 is about \$5.5 billion below the funds provided by Congress for the current fiscal year. The Army would absorb about \$5.3 billion of the cut.

THE ARMY TO BE CUT

The administration's New Look military strategy calls for more reliance on air and new weapons retaliatory power and less on ground forces. Defense officials plan to cut Army strength from 20 to 17 divisions between now and June 30, 1955.

Testimony released by the Appropriations Committee shows that Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, first hit on the Army surplus as an easy target for a quick savings.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is to be commended for finding that there was \$2 billion of unnecessary "fat" in the Army's appropriations for this year.

SALTONSTALL noted that the Army presently has about \$5 billion in past appropriations for procurement and production, and that by June 1955 some \$2 billion of this still will remain unobligated or unused.

He asked why it would not be a good idea to transfer this to some other fund, such as maintenance and operation and thus save it in new appropriations for the Army in the coming fiscal year.

IDEA HELD FEASIBLE

Garlock admitted that SALTONSTALL's idea technically was feasible since the Army has no plans to spend or obligate this \$2 billion in fiscal 1955.

But Garlock said strictly a policy decision had been made in the executive branch that it would be advisable to leave the money in the Army's pockets.

Garlock agreed with SALTONSTALL that the policy decision was based on psychology.

All I can say is, "Is not that fine?" We are asked to appropriate \$2 billion—which some persons do not consider to be a great deal of money. It would cost each family in America \$50—for psychological purposes, so that the people will not be afraid that we will be cutting the Army too much if we do not give it more money than it can possibly use.

The Army has enough money on hand to place such orders, if they are really needed, and after the orders are placed they can be transferred to Foreign Operations.

Foreign Operations has enough funds on hand to carry it for more than 2 years. What the junior Senator from Louisiana is hoping to accomplish is to make those in charge of the program come back to Congress and show how they can make savings in that program.

I have suggested where we could save far more than a billion dollars on the program for Indochina alone, so long as there is a truce in that area and so long as there is a grave danger that the arms we have already sent there will fall into Communist hands. Therefore, what we should be doing with regard to Indochina is to take some precaution to insure that the billions of dollars of arms we have already sent there do not fall into Communist hands.

In addition, there is the possibility of reprogramming and thus saving billions of dollars in the program for Europe. My amendment does not touch the technical-aid program. Relatively speaking, that program is a very small part of the total program for giving away billions of dollars of wealth to our friends and allies around the world.

I had hoped that we would be successful in demonstrating to those in charge of the program that we are at least interested in economy in this program, as in all other programs.

I should like to point out also to Senators that in many instances we are giving away obsolete equipment. In the areas where we are doing that it is not possible to win a war—at least not a modern world war III type of war—with the kind of weapons we are giving those countries. Much of it is being done for psychological reasons, to encourage those countries to resist, and to make it clear that in the event Russia decides to attack it will have to commit a major force to the area, instead of a small group or a group of subversives. It would afford the United States the opportunity to consider its position and to be able to engage in warfare in that area in the event we should decide to become committed.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, I desire to comment on the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] and to commend him for his action. I also wish to express my regret that all Members of the Senate were not present to hear the Senator's fine dissertation on what seems to be wrong with our foreign economic and military-aid program.

Mr. President, at the risk of being repetitious, I shall cite some of the figures which were given by the junior Senator from Louisiana. I think these figures are important. It is too bad that the Congress and the people of the Nation are not familiar with the figures and with the amount of money which has been spent during the past 12 or 14 years for both foreign military and foreign economic aid. I am told, Mr. President—and I am sure these figures can be verified, and in fact have been

documented—that those charged with the responsibility of administering foreign military and economic aid had on hand on June 30 of this year \$9,749,500,000. That is money unexpended, now on hand. Of this amount, there was on hand \$2,604,300,000 of unobligated funds. I think that figure is significant.

Of course, we recognize, properly and rightly so, the distinction between unobligated funds on hand and funds which are obligated but not yet expended. However, the significant figure to my mind is the \$2,604,000,000 which is on hand, unobligated for any particular purpose.

Congress is now asked to appropriate \$3,100,000,000 of new money. If the authorization of \$3,100,000,000 is approved, those charged with the responsibility of administering our foreign military and economic aid program will have on hand for this fiscal year \$12,849,500,000. I repeat that figure. I want Members of the Senate and the people of America to know what those who are charged with the responsibility of administering this fund will have available for expenditure during this fiscal year. I repeat the figure is \$12,849,000,000.

Of this amount it is said—and I believe the statement can be documented—that on the basis of past and future commitments we shall have on hand on June 30, 1955, the sum total of \$7,360,800,000.

Mr. President, I wish that all Members of the Senate and the people of America were familiar with the figures which have been used today on the Senate floor. It is inconceivable to me, as I believe it is to most of the people of our great land, that so much money can be spent beneficially or wisely during any 12 months' period for a program which apparently has failed to an appreciable degree for 12 years.

I recognize that in some areas both military assistance and economic assistance have been of great aid to the peoples and free nations of the world, but today I think we can count on our fingers, perhaps even on the fingers of one hand, the free nations of the world that have benefited by both our military and our economic foreign aid.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think perhaps we can today count on our fingers—and again I say the fingers of one hand—those free nations of the world which have stood up and which are standing up to the onslaught of the communistic march.

I hope the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana will be adopted. I believe that if the people of America knew the amount of money which has been poured into what have been referred to time and time again as rat holes in far corners of the world, they would be here to petition their duly elected representatives in the Senate to call a halt to the continued spending for foreign economic aid.

As I said before, if the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is adopted, there will still be on hand on June 30, 1955, 1 year from now,

or at the end of this fiscal year, the sum total of \$6,326,700,000.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LENNON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator will see that the report states on page 12 that there will be even more than that. According to the committee's report there will be on hand an estimated \$7,360,000,000.

Mr. LENNON. When the Mutual Security Administrators begin to bandy around billions, they pay no attention to 1 billion; perhaps I am short 1 billion in my estimate of what they would have on hand.

Mr. LONG. Perhaps we are both talking about the same thing. If my amendment fails, there will be on hand \$7,360,000,000. If my amendment carries, there will be on hand at this time next year six-billion-three-hundred-and-thirty-some-odd-million dollars.

Mr. LENNON. I accept the correction from the junior Senator from Louisiana and say to the Senate that certainly, to my way of thinking—and I believe to the way of thinking of the majority of the people of the United States—those figures are an indication of the fact that we have appropriated tremendous sums for foreign aid and yet, as the Senator from Louisiana so ably pointed out, we continue piling up and putting into the hands of those charged with responsibility for this program enormous amounts of money which they cannot even anticipate spending any time in the near future.

Mr. President, I mentioned a while ago that on June 30 of this year those charged with the responsibility of administering the foreign-economic and military-aid program had on hand \$9,749,000,000. This means that the sum total of \$4,250,500,000 was spent from June 30, 1953, to June 30, 1954.

It is now said that we are cutting down on foreign aid, especially foreign-economic aid. Let us see if that is so. Actually, if the bill now before the Senate is passed without the Long amendment there will be \$5,704,300,000 of new money and carried over, unobligated funds for the present fiscal year. That means that there will be available for the present fiscal year \$1,443,000,000 more than was spent during the past fiscal year. Yet there are those who say that we are making an honest effort to cut down foreign economic-aid spending.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LENNON. Yes.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will subtract from the gross amount of funds which the administration will have on hand, which is \$12,800,000,000, the amount that it is expected to remain at this time next year, which is \$7,360,000,000, the Senator will see that the difference is \$5,489,000,000, which represents the most rapid rate at which we have given away money in the history of the country in this type of program.

Mr. LENNON. The Senator is eminently correct. It is a far departure, Mr.

President, from a wise spending program for this purpose.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield, I should correct my statement by saying that it is the most rapid rate at which we have given away money in the peacetime history of such a program.

Mr. LENNON. The Senator is correct. I think that statement is generally understood and accepted. It is a far departure from the statement of the present administration that it would lend its efforts toward economy in government, toward an honest effort to balance the budget, and ultimately, toward reducing the national debt.

I recall that during the last week of July, last year, the Senate debated for about 4 days the appropriation for the Mutual Security Act. There were Senators who took the position—and I think correctly—that an overall ceiling should be placed upon the amount of new funds which could be appropriated by Congress in the last session, in the amount of \$5,500,000,000. We who supported the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] lost that fight. But it is significant that during the months of the late summer and fall of last year, according to the press of the United States, Members of the Senate and the House who had traveled in the far corners of the world returned to the United States and, almost uniformly, reported that economic conditions were good in the approximately 60 nations which the United States virtually has been carrying on its back for the past 10 or 12 years.

I was happy and delighted that I had had the pleasure of supporting amendments which would have substantially reduced foreign economic spending, especially after I had read the statements made by Members of Congress who had personally visited many of the countries which were receiving aid from the United States.

I was pleased, too, when the President of the United States, in his message on the state of the Union, made the statement that the time at last had come when the Government could substantially reduce spending for foreign economic aid. Yet the figures which have been produced in connection with the bill under consideration indicate that it will be necessary to spend in new money this year, in addition to the unobligated funds which were carried over from the past fiscal year, more than a billion dollars in excess of what was spent from June 30, 1953, to June 30, 1954.

I recognize the fact that the people of the United States are now ready to say "No" to a continuation of foreign economic spending. Let us consider how the administration is approaching the question of such spending. By the way, it is no longer called "foreign economic spending." Formerly it was referred to as military assistance and foreign economic assistance. But those terms are no longer used. Today there is military assistance. All of us know what that is. That means guns, tanks, planes, ammunition, material of war—the sinews of war.

But what formerly was called economic support is now called direct forces sup-

port. There is still another name for economic support. It is defense support. In addition, there is relief and rehabilitation. Another category is development assistance.

Frankly, if the people of America correctly understood the situation, I believe their sentiment would be such that they would be in Washington petitioning Members of Congress to curtail such spending.

I do not believe the people of America would agree to a continuation of foreign economic assistance if they knew that the administration is now providing such assistance under such terms as direct forces assistance, defense support, relief and rehabilitation, and development assistance. Frankly, there has never been in my mind any distinction between economic assistance and direct forces support, defense support, relief and rehabilitation, and development assistance.

I recall, as I am sure all other Members of the Senate must recall, that during the week of June 12, I believe, the Senate considered the National Defense Appropriation Act—the "big baby," if you please, to appropriations. I remember, too, the heated debate which was carried on by some Members of the Senate, led by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], in their efforts to restore to the national-defense appropriation bill a sufficient sum of money to provide for two divisions to be kept in the Far East, especially in Korea. I was not one of those who supported that amendment, because I had been informed that the Department of Defense actually had on hand \$75 billion to be expended for national defense. I am sure that the information was factual; as a matter of fact, it was given on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Having that figure in mind, I voted against the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, which would have restored to the bill a sufficient amount of money for the arming of two divisions, which otherwise, it had been said, would be eliminated.

Let us examine to see what happened. I remember that Members of the Senate were confused. I was confused; and certainly if other Members of the Senate were confused, the people of America had an excuse for being confused—and I believe they were confused. This is what I mean by that. Time and again one could have picked up the newspapers of America and have read in them or in some of the leading magazines statements made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by other persons who were charged with the responsibility of knowing what the defense needs of the United States were. The public announcements by those persons were to the effect that the United States was running behind Russia in the armament race.

Yet those same persons, to whom the people of America have a right to look for advice and counsel in all things pertaining to national defense, would appear before the Committee on Armed Services, and perhaps even before the

Committee on Foreign Relations, and state for the record that the appropriations recommended by the administration for national defense purposes were sufficient. Those statements were almost certainly, in my mind, and I believe in the minds of the American people, in direct conflict with what those same persons were saying about our defense needs publicly and to Members of Congress, who are charged, in the final analysis, with the responsibility of our national defense program.

So the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] was defeated on, Thursday, June 17, if I recall correctly. It was rejected largely, in my opinion, because of the statement made by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], when, in his colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] he said he understood that \$75 billion was available for national defense, including money provided for in the bill, along with obligated and unobligated funds which had been carried over.

On the following Monday, I believe, the Department of Defense, through the office of its Comptroller—I assume that is the technical name of the officer—made a statement to the press that the Army budget, which was included in the national defense budget, had a surplus of \$2 billion—in other words, \$2 billion worth of fat. Yet distinguished Members of the Senate had stood on the floor and assured the Senate that that budget had been cut to the bone. Were they sincere? Certainly they were sincere. The reason for such statements by Senators was that information had been withheld from the Members of the committee. I see no other explanation for the situation.

In like manner, I believe that there is a great deal of fat in the mutual security bill. I do not believe that the Senate should cut the bill to the bone, to the sinew, or to the marrow, but I believe the bill should be stripped of every unessential element. I think there is much fat in the bill.

I am also reminded of statements which were made about 2 weeks ago in the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Incidentally, I wish to say that, in my judgment, the senior Senator from Virginia probably has a greater knowledge of the fiscal affairs of the Nation than is possessed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Budget, combined.

The Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Virginia submitted a resolution which I thought should have claimed the attention of Members of this body, and I hope it has. The resolution called for a constitutional amendment which would have made the Congress of the United States face up to its responsibility—and I say it is a grave one, Mr. President—that some day it must balance the budget.

I am reminded, Mr. President—and I am sure all other Members of this body

are—that on the eve of adjournment last year, when many Members of Congress had obtained their plane and train reservations, there was laid on the desk of every Member of the Congress what amounted to an ultimatum from the President of the United States which called on the Congress to raise the national debt limit from \$275 billion to \$290 billion.

I am sure that request or ultimatum must have given Members of the Congress a great deal of concern, coming to us as it did while Congress was in the throes of the effort to bring about final adjournment. I am sure it caused a great many of us to do some research work in an attempt to ascertain just where this Nation stood with respect to its fiscal and financial obligations as compared with those of the 60 nations of the world which we have virtually carried on our back for a number of years. It was my desire to seek information on the question, because I believed that very likely I would be called upon to cast my vote for or against the proposal to raise the national debt limit from \$275 billion to \$290 billion.

I raise this question, Mr. President, because, as surely as we are in the Senate today, we shall be again faced with the question of whether or not we shall vote to increase the national debt limit, if not by \$15 billion, at least by \$5 billion.

When the request of the President to raise the national debt limit came to the Congress, the House of Representatives passed the proposal, after it was considered by the House Ways and Means Committee. I am glad to report to this body that the Members of the North Carolina delegation in the other House opposed raising the national debt limit. When the proposal came to the Senate, it was referred to the Committee on Finance. Because I knew I would be faced with the responsibility of voting "yea" or "nay" if the proposal came to a vote, I consulted the records. I learned that the national debt limit of our country today is \$100 billion more—and I repeat it for emphasis, \$100 billion more—than the national debt limit of all the countries of Europe, Russia and her satellites. That fact startled me, as I am sure it must have startled many persons who had sought and obtained the same information.

Again, Mr. President, in a matter of a few days I am advised the Senate will be called upon to raise the national debt limit. I for one shall oppose legislation which would authorize it, if such a proposal should come to the Senate from the Finance Committee. I could not support a mutual security program which calls for the expenditure of more than \$5 billion, either in new money or in unobligated money, and then in good conscience vote to increase the national debt limit.

I should like to have the opportunity, if possible, to vote for an amendment which would strip the mutual security bill to all except exclusively military aid. Frankly and honestly, I think that is the inner feeling of a majority of Members of the Senate. If an amendment to the

bill were offered which proposed to strip the authorization for the expenditure of funds for everything except pure, unadulterated military assistance, such as guns, planes, tanks, and all the materials and sinews of war, I believe the amendment would be adopted.

I hope the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana will meet with the honest appraisal and approval of Members of the Senate.

Last year, when the mutual security bill was enacted, the RECORD shows that those charged with the responsibility of administering the act had \$14 billion to spend in the fiscal year which has just ended. How much of that \$14 billion was spent? Just a little more than \$4 billion. Yet it is proposed that we continue to raise the ante, and that we increase the amount appropriated for that purpose. The proposal is not for the purpose of getting such materials into the pipelines. The pipelines are so full that, even with hydraulic pressure, no more materials could be forced through them. No more materials could be put into the pipelines than are presently there, and which will be there continuously. Why should we give those who are charged with the responsibility of administering the program a tremendous amount of money which will not be used, and which could be used for so many domestic needs which press upon our country today?

If the bill is passed in its present form, I am sure that at least Senators who vote for it—and I hope Members of the Senate will listen to me as I make my prediction—will be almost compelled to vote for an extension of the national debt limit. My conscience will be clear, because I intend to support, with all the vigor at my command, the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana. I only wish the Senator could devise a way to go farther than he now proposes to go and to include the stripping of everything from the bill except military assistance, and military assistance alone.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LENNON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator agree with me that the effect of passing the bill, in view of the enormous backlog of more than \$9 billion already on hand, which is available to the Foreign Operations Administration, would be to admonish those handling the administration of the fund and to say in effect to them, "Why have you not spent the money more rapidly than you have?"

Mr. LENNON. I think the Senator is eminently correct. It seems to me that if a person is given \$1,000, which he does not spend judiciously, beneficially, or wisely, and yet \$1,000 bills continue to be forced upon him, that person is told in effect, "You must spend it. You had better get rid of it." That seems to be the idea of those charged with the administration of the fund. I cannot understand the reason for it, and I have not yet heard a statement on the floor of the Senate by any Senator regarding the

necessity for continuing to appropriate new funds.

It seems to me that the more than \$2 billion of unobligated funds are in themselves sufficient to be spent, along with the \$7 billion which is available. Of course, some of it is obligated. Nevertheless, it is unexpended; and these programs are changing and varying rapidly. The \$7 billion which the Foreign Operations Administration claim now is obligated, but unexpended, perhaps in substantial part may not be obligated a month from now, because the program is changing.

I understand these long-range programs for the construction of war implements contain provisions enabling the Department to void the contracts in the event of technical developments and technical changes—and properly so. So I take the position that perhaps only half of the \$7 billion is really unobligated.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from North Carolina realize that the allies have on hand upwards of \$20 billion worth of American arms which we have given them in previous years, in addition to the \$9 billion that the Foreign Operations Administration has on hand, to be sent to those countries?

Mr. LENNON. I certainly am aware of that. I am also aware of the fact that it is not possible to obtain friendship by spending money. This country has made an effort for 10 or 12 years to buy the personal friendship and the military friendship of many of the other peoples of the world. We have succeeded only in some faraway places.

I do not believe that the Members of the Senate agree or that the people of the United States agree with the present basic political philosophy of either of our great allies, the French or the British. If there are any countries in the world that have ever had the benefit of our generosity—and properly so in many instances, I believe—it is those two countries. Yet they differ with us basically on the recognition of Red China.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REYNOLDS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Delaware for a question?

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I yield, provided it is understood that I shall not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Louisiana whether he knows the value of our military equipment that is now at Hanoi?

Mr. LONG. I do not have the actual figures, but I have heard estimates running as high as \$450 million in the case

of United States military equipment which has not even been uncrated, and is now in Indochina, on the docks—in addition to the more than \$1 billion of equipment we already have sent there.

Of course the Senator from Delaware knows that by this time the Communists are well armed. If they did not have any arms to begin with, certainly after the capture of Dien Bien Phu and other French posts, the Communists now are well equipped with American arms.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not also true that if we use proper precautions, we may salvage equipment valued at half the amount the Senator from Louisiana proposes as a reduction in the authorizations in the pending mutual-security bill?

Mr. LONG. That is entirely correct.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will permit me to ask a further question of the Senator from Louisiana—

Mr. MORSE. Certainly, on the same basis as before.

Mr. FREAR. Then, on the point to which we have just referred, would it not be possible for us, by means of the salvage of such equipment, to save equipment valued at half the amount of the decrease in the authorization proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana? In fact, I have heard estimates considerably higher than that. However, Indochina is only one place where we have military equipment. So we would have only a little trouble in salvaging or regaining control of \$1 billion worth of equipment, and that would cover the entire amount of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. My best understanding is that there is more than \$400 million worth of military equipment in Indochina now, on the docks, crated, in addition to a billion dollars' worth of equipment we have previously sent there; and there is also in the pipeline, programed to go to Indochina, more than \$700 million of last year's appropriation for Indochina.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. LONG. In addition, this bill calls for another \$800 million worth for Indochina.

So it seems to me that if we wished to do first things first, the first thing we should try to do, is to save the billion dollar's worth of equipment we already have sent there; we should save it by preventing it from falling into Communist hands, for it makes good sense that a billion dollars' worth of our equipment falling into Communist hands will require another billion dollars of expenditure on our part to offset that much addition to the Communists' fighting power.

Mr. FREAR. I think that is a very good point—that in addition to the \$400 million or \$600 million of our equipment which is on the docks there now, crated, there is another \$700 million or \$800 million of equipment lying somewhere, which we might salvage; and that would mean that the Communists or the opposition would have to spend that much

more money of their own, in order to be that well prepared.

That reminds me of the fact that every Republican who votes for a Democrat means two votes for the Democrat. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks in summing up the philosophy which I think is apparent in the bill, and also in registering a few exceptions to that philosophy.

At one time I considered offering an amendment to the bill providing for a \$50 million increase in the appropriation for aid to the one beachhead of freedom in the Middle East, namely, the State of Israel. But after consultation with my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and with some other members of the Foreign Relations Committee and with certain officials of the State Department, I decided not to offer the amendment. I wish to make clear that if an informal count of votes here in the Senate indicated that the amendment would pass I would offer it. However, such a count shows it would be defeated.

However, Mr. President, I wish to make these comments in regard to what I consider to be the shortcomings of the bill in respect to the State of Israel.

When we go through the bill, it is very interesting to find that it has been drafted in such a way as to fail to earmark any specific sums of money for aid to specific countries in the Middle East. We read the bill in vain if we seek to find in it any specific item of aid in dollars to the State of Israel. I think that is regrettable, Mr. President.

I am advised by members of the committee that the bill contains language making it clear that the State of Israel will receive some aid. However, the bill does not say so specifically in terms of a given amount of money. Let me say that if I am in error about this matter, I wish the chairman of the committee to put me right, by documenting a citation to the section and line of the bill which corrects the statement I just made if my statement is not correct. I am advised that certain language in the bill means that approximately \$40 million will be available for the State of Israel. However, the language does not say so specifically. It gives the widest discretion to the State Department in this matter. There is no assurance that Israel will receive anything.

Mr. President, let us accept the assumption that Israel will get \$40 million although no such fund is so earmarked in the bill. But let us accept the assumption. If true, the fund is most inadequate. It is most inadequate when we consider the moral obligations of the United States and the people of the United States to Israel. It is most inadequate when we consider the meaning and the symbolism of Israel in the Middle East.

I wish to address myself briefly to these two points, and then to discuss briefly a third one, namely, the attitude of the United States in the years to come in connection with the entire problem

of colonialism in the world and the relationship of that problem to the foreign policy of the United States.

First, Mr. President, let me say that I do not think we have ever started to fulfill our moral obligations to the State of Israel. Let us consider the situation in the year 1946. In that year, we came to the end of World War II. We should always keep in mind the fact that one of the causes of our entering the Second World War in the first instance was the revulsion of feeling throughout the body politic in the United States over the atrocities and the persecutions by Nazi Germany of minority groups. It was in 1946, Mr. President, that I performed a confidential mission for the then Secretary of War, Mr. Robert Patterson. I inspected the displaced persons camps in Europe, and I returned and made my report to him. Later, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, I made certain comments on the floor of the Senate.

I pointed out then that there was no question of the fact that we had a tremendous moral obligation to see to it that the masses of people in those concentration camps—because that is what they were in fact, although they were called displaced persons camps—should be distributed among the free nations of the world. I urged in a speech on the floor of the Senate at that time that the United States Government take the initiative in asking the Prime Ministers of the free nations of the world or their representatives to meet in a conference of foreign ministers for the purpose of seeing if an international understanding could not be reached whereby we would participate in distributing among the free nations of the world the people in the concentration camps.

I did not get anywhere with that suggestion, Mr. President. It was very interesting that as early as 1946 and 1947, we were falling back into the old American pattern of forgetting too quickly our responsibilities in regard to an international situation and the moral obligations involved therein.

I remember that in the cloakrooms of the Senate my suggestion was met by the comment on the part of some of my colleagues, "I would not go for that because most of them are Jews." Factually, those colleagues were wrong. It so happened that in 1946 and 1947 a majority of the inhabitants of the displaced persons camps of Europe were not Jews.

But I asked then, as I have asked many times since, suppose it were true? What does that have to do with America's moral obligations to human beings who have been persecuted, which persecutions formed a part of the reason for our going into World War II? There was still an obligation on the part of the United States to do something for the inhabitants of those displaced persons camps by assisting in bringing them to lands of freedom, even if it happened to be true—which it was not—that a majority of them were Jews.

A large number of them were Jews; and in respect to those, the State of Israel, at that time known as Palestine, came to the assistance of the so-called

Jewish refugees, and, in spite of strong British opposition—and let us not forget the role that Great Britain played in 1946 and 1947 in connection with this problem—in spite of British opposition and British attempts to prevent those refugees from landing on the shores of Palestine, thousands upon thousands of them sought Palestine as a source of refuge.

I think the people of Palestine wrote a glorious and thrilling chapter in the history of world humanitarianism by putting into effect the Biblical teaching that, after all, we human beings are our brother's keeper. A homeland was provided for those refugees; and, to the extent that the people of Palestine took care of those refugees, they assumed a burden of moral obligation which was also partly the burden of the United States and the burden of every other nation in the world that believed in personal freedom, human dignity, and human decency.

In my judgment, Mr. President, when we add up the aid that the United States has given to this little beachhead of freedom in the Middle East, it is but a mite, a pittance, in comparison with what I think our true obligation is to that republic of freedom in the Middle East.

Let us take a look at that republic. It cannot be denied that it is a republic which has been established with the sanction of the United Nations. It belongs to the family of free nations, and it has the stamp of approval of the United Nations upon it. Because it is a member of the family of free nations, I respectfully say that free men and women everywhere have a stake in the freedom of Israel. It is surrounded by economic feudalism. It is surrounded by many countries in which the principles of democratic processes do not exist.

Let me make very clear that the junior Senator from Oregon is perfectly willing to be of economic aid to the Arab States, if they have a willingness to help improve the economic plight of the masses of their population. I am very desirous, Mr. President, of being of aid to the Arab States by bringing to their people a standard of living under which economic freedom of choice for the individual can exist there, too. It does not now exist.

I have no intention, Mr. President, as a Member of the United States Senate, of ever following a course of action in this body which would add up to trading the freedom of Israel and right to liberty of the people of Israel for Arabian oil.

I hope I am realistic enough to recognize that if we get into a third holocaust, no nation will get the benefit of that oil. If we wish to talk about the problem of Arabian oil from the standpoint of the ugly realities incident to a possible third world war, let us face the fact that no nation will get the oil because it will be one of the prime targets. Every power involved will try to prevent the other powers from getting the oil. It will be destroyed, so far as accessibility for the duration of that war is concerned. There would be hardly any other target more vital than the derricks

and refineries connected with Arabian oil fields.

But, Mr. President, I do not argue this issue on the basis of Arabian oil. I argue on the basis of our moral obligation to be of assistance to a beachhead of freedom in an area of the world where the symbolism of freedom should be strengthened.

Although I expect to be criticized for it, the fact that I will be criticised in no sense deters me on this issue, and it has never deterred me in the past in connection with any other issue. If we do not give strength to the State of Israel, we shall be building a foreign policy which lets freedom down in the world.

Israel has made a great many mistakes. I do not condone any of Israel's mistakes. I do not condone the violation of the truce by Israel. In my judgment, the State of Israel must be charged with at least assuming responsibility for those violations. However, Israel has not been alone in violation of the truce.

I am not dealing with comparative statistics on violations. I make the assertion—and I am sure it can not be contradicted by the record—that violations of the truce have been at least as frequent—if not more frequent—by the Arab States as by Israel. I hope I am a good enough lawyer to know that, although provocations never justify a wrong, they often explain why the wrong occurred. Provocations often provide an explanation of the motivation and causation of wrongful conduct.

I have been heard to say many times—and I repeat it today—that if we believe in a system of international justice through law, the policy of the United States State Department always should be to seek to call to account before the United Nations, through an international judicial tribunal of the United Nations, both Israel and the Arab States for any violation of the truce. That is the position of the junior Senator from Oregon, and it will always be his position.

However, we cannot explain the State Department's attitude toward Israel over the past 14 months on the basis of that principle. In my judgment, ever since the visit of the Secretary of State to the Middle East a little more than a year ago, his course of conduct and his pronouncements have been subject to the clear criticism that apparently the policy of the State Department is in part to win the friendship of the Arab States at the expense of Israel. I am critical of that course of action on the part of the Secretary of State. I am critical because apparently every time there has been a violation of the truce by Israel a statement of condemnation has been issued by the Department of State; whereas too frequently when there has been a like violation on the part of the Arab States there has been no such severe censure by the State Department.

I repeat that, in my judgment, the obligation of the United States in its foreign policy in connection with that serious situation in the Middle East is to make it clear to all parties in those disputes that they must submit their differences to the United Nations, and through

the United Nations to its international judicial tribunal, for decision and determination by the application of the rules of reason applied to a record of evidence.

I have been very much disturbed about what, in my judgment, has been a lack of adequate support on the part of the United States Government of the Republic of Israel in the Middle East. I have been disturbed by the apparent readiness of the United States State Department to supply arms to the Arab States. One example is the situation in Iraq. Not so long ago the Department of State took the position that arms should be supplied to Iraq, and gave as its explanation that they were needed in order to take care of internal disorder in Iraq. I do not know whom our State Department officials thought they were fooling. In my judgment, they did not fool anyone who knows the facts with respect to the Middle East. I cannot overlook the fact that during World War II the Iraq army went over to the Nazis. They were on the side of the Nazis. It may be that there is justification for believing that in the future we can count upon Iraq as an ally. However, judging by the past, it is very dubious.

Furthermore, let me mention, in passing—because it deals with the third point I wish to mention in these brief remarks—that when we are dealing with the Arab States, we are, after all, not dealing with governments based upon democratic processes. We are not dealing with governments in which the people are the masters and the governments the servants, as is the case when we are dealing with the Republic of Israel. It is another case in which we are apparently giving way to our great fear of the expansion and aggressive intentions of Russia. Therefore, we are willing to give support to other forms of totalitarianism, which in my book are very little different from communistic totalitarianism.

The issue of totalitarianism must be directed to the rights of the individual citizen. Whether a citizen in any country lives under the totalitarianism of communism or fascism does not make very much difference so far as his personal liberty and personal dignity are concerned.

Therefore, I say that we had better give greater attention to the need for aiding freedom in the world, instead of to an American foreign policy based upon the doctrine of the expediency of encouraging and aiding totalitarianism in the world.

The next point I wish to make is that we had better recognize, before it is too late, that the greatest defense weapon the United States has and will have for the century ahead and longer is the economic productive power of men and women in other parts of the world who are willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with us in the contest between freedom and totalitarianism, a contest which will continue for a long time.

In the Middle East there is a little republic which, in my judgment, ought to be strengthened. Instead, its enemies

abroad and some powerful forces here at home would undermine the economically productive power of Israel by seeing to it that the maximum amount of her resources is devoted to military defense. Dollars spent for military defense are not economically productive. In my judgment, if we are to give military aid to the Arab States, as we have been doing, we have a moral obligation toward the Republic of Israel to do the same for Israel. I return to that point because I premise my speech on the basis of a moral obligation to the cause of freedom and the relationship of that cause to American foreign policy. If we are to give military aid to the Arab States—and we have been giving such aid even though they do not belong to NATO and even though the mutual obligations of NATO are not involved in such military aid, we have the clear moral obligation to see to it that adequate defense funds are made available to Israel, so that the economic life of Israel will not be sucked dry by forcing her to use a large percentage of her income and economic resources for defense purposes.

In my judgment we have the moral obligation to protect this state of freedom in the Middle East by making very clear that such aid as we give to the Arab States under the pretext of seeing that they have the equipment to keep down internal disorder should at least be counterbalanced and matched by adequate defenses in Israel so that the Arab States will not be tempted to prosecute a war against the state of freedom in the Middle East, namely, Israel.

In my judgment, if it is true that in this bill some \$40 million is available for Israel, it is but a pittance in view of the tremendous forces now being used in order to reduce to impotency the economic and military strength of this republic in the Middle East.

Mr. President, when I think of the treatment that Israel received not so many years ago from the British Empire, and of the treatment she is receiving today from the Arab States, I wonder what the attitude of the United States would be if Israel were in a position, for example, to apply to some other country the kind of boycott that has been applied to Israel in relation to the use of the Suez Canal. In my judgment it would be necessary to supply the Secretary of State with a piece of asbestos paper on which to write the kind of protest that would be sent to Israel if she invoked such a boycott. Yet in my judgment the part we have played in connection with the boycott of the Suez Canal and the effect of that boycott on the State of Israel has amounted to a very feeble slap-on-the-wrist approach, in the field of diplomacy, to the Middle East situation.

Knowing that there are those who think it would be a mistake to offer the amendment which I suggested I had originally contemplated, to increase aid to Israel by at least another \$50 million, and knowing also that in view of the attitude now prevailing in the Senate the amendment would not be adopted anyway, I felt at least a clear moral ob-

ligation to raise my voice today in protest against what I think has been the unfortunate policy followed by the Secretary of State during the past year or more in regard to the State of Israel. I raise my voice to urge that we recognize, before it is too late, that the greatest defense weapon we have is the economic productive power of free men and women everywhere in the world. The fight for freedom in the next century will be won only to the extent that we are able to build up a better standard of living, provide economic opportunity, and export the know-how of enlightened American capitalism to those sections of the world where the need for economic improvement is so pressing upon the people and on the basis of which need the vicious, lying Russian Communist propagandists make so much political hay.

Mr. President, when we come to consider economic aid, in my judgment such aid produces more security for the United States than all the guns, ammunition, and airplanes that may be shipped to foreign countries, important as armaments are.

I do not propose to curtail military aid, because I recognize that we must keep free peoples strong militarily for years to come if we are to hold in check the aggressive intentions of Russia. She certainly has demonstrated such intentions time and time again. Let a segment of the world become militarily weak to the extent that Soviet Russia thinks she can move in, and she will move in. That is why I am such a strong advocate, for example, not only of NATO, but of a corresponding organization in Asia, where the free nations together—not the United States on a go-it-alone policy—will stand shoulder-to-shoulder against the danger of an aggressive course of action on the part of Russian totalitarianism.

I plead today for aid to freedom, because that is what the fight is all about. The struggle for the century ahead will be a struggle to strengthen the cause of freedom against the enslavement of totalitarianism.

That brings me to the third and the last point of my speech. Much has been said on the floor of the Senate in recent weeks about a reexamination of American foreign policy. We should reexamine it, Mr. President. We should reexamine it from every angle. I am for such reexamination. I wish to suggest one angle from which we ought to reexamine it. We ought to reexamine it from the angle of the criticism which confronts us all over the world, in those areas of the world where masses of people are struggling for freedom against colonialism, against the economic imperialism—at least in their sight—of powerful colonial countries. We cannot ignore it. We must come to grips with it. We must be frank and honest with our colonial-minded allies. We must be frank and honest with Great Britain, France, Holland, and other nations.

Mr. President, we have no answer for this rising tide in the course of human events. There is nothing the United

States can do, and there is nothing that Great Britain, France, Holland, or any other power can do, to stem the trend of human events for the century ahead—a trend which is obvious if one will but read the handwriting on the wall. In every one of the so-called backward areas of the world the answer is the same. The trend exists, and can be seen if one will but open his eyes and look. In every backward area of the world where at present a policy of economic colonialism and imperialism exists, the people are rising up against it. The question is, Are we to follow an American course of action in the field of foreign policy which will cause those people to be on the side of freedom with us, or are we to continue to follow a course of action supporting colonialism, imperialism, and totalitarianism in the world, and drive free people behind the Communist Iron Curtain?

Mr. President, if we do not stand with them in their fight for human freedom, in their fight for emancipation from the colonialism of powerful western nations, they will go behind the Iron Curtain, because they will fall victims to the vicious, lying propaganda of the Russians that behind the Iron Curtain they can get more to eat, more with which to clothe their children, and better living conditions.

We know that such propaganda is not true, but we cannot convince our friends of that if at the same time we support a policy of colonialism.

Much has been said on the floor of the Senate about American mistakes in Asia, and there have been many. I am perfectly willing to stand on the record as to my position about those mistakes, referring to speeches I made on the floor of the Senate as early as 1945 and 1946 and 1947 and every intervening year between then and now.

One of the greatest mistakes we have made in Asia is that apparently we lacked the courage to tell our free allies we could not support their colonial policies in Asia. In my judgment, one of the reasons why the mess in Indochina developed was that we were not frank enough with France. We should have made clear to France that we were in favor of protecting the freedom of the Indochinese, but not at the price of maintenance of French colonialism in Indochina.

I have always said, and I repeat now, Mr. President, I think possibly the most important issue in the whole Indochina matter was an issue many Americans did not want to face—the issue of Morocco. In my judgment, Morocco had more to do with Indochina than any other single factor because I think it was perfectly clear the French were afraid that a complete withdrawal of their colonial policy in Indochina would jeopardize their colonial policy in Morocco, and Morocco happens to be a very, very valuable colonial asset to France.

Just as surely as that we are in the Senate today, Mr. President, in my judgment, any Senator who is 55 years of age or younger, if God permits him to have the normal longevity Americans enjoy, will live to see the end of French colonialism in Morocco. That is the hand-

writing on the wall. We should not stick our heads in the sand about it. I believe we have an obligation to our colonial-minded allies to make clear to them we are going to be of assistance to them in solving their economic problems, but that from the standpoint of their colonial policies and from the standpoint of what American freedom stands for, we can no longer give support to the suppression of peoples in the so-called backward areas of the world by the imposition upon them of a policy of colonialism.

I have been very frank about this issue, Mr. President, but, in my judgment, someone needs to be frank about it, because a failure to face the issue may involve in the future the lives of many American civilians, as well as many American boys who may find themselves in uniform. I do not think we can continue during the decades ahead to support a policy of economic domination of peoples in the backward areas of the world by other powerful nations and still have peace in the world.

Economic freedom in the backward areas of the world represents a cause for which millions of people are going to be willing to die until ultimate victory is theirs. This is the record, Mr. President, of what happens to people once they are imbued with a dedicated devotion to the concept of freedom. Read the history of the development of great social and economic movements in the history of civilization and such a story will unfold.

In this historic era we see the great human movement to attain freedom on the part of peoples who have been denied freedom heretofore; and they are going to achieve their objective.

I wish to see my country always on the side of freedom. That means, of course, we must carry on statesmanlike diplomacy. It means we have to face world economic problems from the standpoint of recognizing that no nation can live unto itself alone economically and survive on through the future—not even the United States. Oh, in our lifetime we can do it, of course; but we are a baby Nation. America has not lived long in the history of mankind. There have been other civilizations as great for their era as ours is for our era, which thought they could live unto themselves alone. Those civilizations thought they could enjoy standards of living in perpetuity so far superior to the standards of the peoples surrounding them that they need have no fear as to their survival; but they did not survive.

The "have not" nations have a way, we learn from history, of wearing down the so-called have nations which believe they can hold economic advantage unto themselves and live within themselves.

In these days voices must be raised in America pleading for an historic perspective and for a recognition of the importance of thinking in terms of historic time, in terms of the American boys and girls 300 years from now. That is the challenge of our generation, as I see it.

I think that challenge is involved in this aid bill, even though it is not written in such language, because the philosophy underlying this aid bill ought to be the

principle that, after all, the soundest foreign policy from a moral standpoint is one which recognizes we are our brother's keeper. We must recognize that the moral law is the soundest foreign policy a free people who believe in the dignity of the individual can follow in terms of history.

That is why, Mr. President, I say, in closing, we must be frank with our allies. We must not maneuver ourselves into the position our State Department allowed us to be maneuvered into when it took the position that it would not support a vote in the United Nations on Tunisia and Morocco. Why not support such a vote? Why should the people of Tunisia and Morocco not be heard in the United Nations on their case?

Mr. President, when we take the position we took on that issue, what do we do? We open ourselves to the charge that we are aiding and abetting the exploiting policies of colonialism.

I have been to the section of the world where colonialism prevails. If a person goes there he cannot be there long without recognizing the equities and the merits of the moral case of the natives of those colonial lands.

My attention has recently been called, Mr. President, to the Cyprus issue in the Middle East. Apparently, under the "head in the sand" attitude of the British Government, there is no issue in Cyprus. Let anyone who thinks the British are right about that go to Cyprus, look over the situation, and see for himself. If he goes there, he cannot deny the fact that the nationalistic spirit of the people of Cyprus for self-determination is unanswerable; yet the British Government is taking the position there is no Cyprus issue. The fact is that 80 percent of the people of Cyprus are Greeks. For years and years they have wanted to be united with Greece.

I note in this morning's New York Times, Mr. President, an article which says, "Britain will curb Cyprus agitation. She invokes old antisedition laws to silence advocates of union with Greece."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this article included in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN WILL CURB CYPRUS AGITATION—SHE INVOKES OLD ANTISEDITION LAWS TO SILENCE ADVOCATES OF UNION WITH GREECE

NICOSIA, CYPRUS, August 2.—The Cyprus Government, in an effort to stamp out illegal agitation for a union of Cyprus with Greece has decided on strict enforcement of existing laws against sedition.

C. G. Tornaritis, attorney general, summoned a press conference today and read a proclamation that had been posted in towns and villages.

The right of citizens to candid, free, and full discussion of any public matter will not be interfered with, he explained, but writings and practices aimed at changing the sovereignty of the colony or at exciting discontent against the Government will not be tolerated.

The proclamation warned that criticism of Government policy in the future must not stray into the sphere of sedition, and

that henceforth the present law of sedition would be strictly enforced.

A person convicted of seditious conspiracy or publication with seditious intention is liable to 5 years' imprisonment.

Any organization advocating the carrying out of seditious intention is an illegal association whose officials are liable to 5 years' imprisonment and its members to 3 years, the proclamation added.

A newspaper in which a seditious libel is published may be suspended by the court for 3 years. A naturalized British subject who has shown himself disloyal toward Queen Elizabeth II may be deprived of British nationality.

Mr. MORSE. Great Britain can apply all the antisedition laws she cares to invoke. Yes; by the use of a greater force, Mr. President, she can put down for the time being this agitation on the part of the people of Cyprus for the advantages of self-determination and human rights and freedom, but this spirit of freedom will rise again to plague Great Britain, and to plague the United States if we aid and abet the policy of colonialism.

Certainly the people of Cyprus should be heard in the United Nations, Mr. President. I hold in my hand the New York Times for Thursday, July 29, 1954, which contains an article headed, "Britain Proposes a Cyprus Charter." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN PROPOSES A CYPRUS CHARTER—MOVE DENOUNCED BY LABORITES FOR NOT ALLOWING ISLAND TO QUIT COMMONWEALTH

LONDON, July 28.—The Government announced today it intended to give Cyprus a new constitution on the pattern of those of Britain's African and Asian colonies. The move ran into immediate criticism from Laborites.

The constitution would provide a legislature of which only a minority would be elected, the majority being composed of colonial officials and the governor's appointees. This is the same pattern applied in politically immature colonies as they begin to move toward self-government.

Unlike most such constitutions, this one has been prepared without consultation with the inhabitants of Cyprus themselves, who are so zealous for union with Greece that they refused to consider a similar constitution offered in 1948.

A debate arose over the fact that Cyprus, unlike other maturing colonies, will not be allowed to leave the Commonwealth if it wishes to. This restriction, announced by Henry L. Hopkinson, Minister of State in the Colonial Office, was called hypercritical by Tom Driberg, a leftwing Laborite. The speaker of the house required Mr. Driberg to withdraw the word.

Aneurin Bevan, leader of the Labor Party's leftwing, said the Government stand would be fiercely resented by the population of Cyprus.

He connected the offer with the pending British withdrawal of troops from Egypt, which had been anticipated by the removal of the Middle East command to Cyprus. He said the command was being established "in the middle of a hostile colony, made more hostile by the extremely unfortunate language used this afternoon."

Mr. Hopkinson had declared it always had been understood and agreed that certain

commonwealth territories could never be expected to be fully independent. He was backed up by the outgoing Colonial Secretary, Oliver Lyttelton, who told the House of Commons this might be the last occasion he would address it.

Mr. Lyttelton said Britain could not turn Cyprus over to Greece, as a large number of Cypriots desired, because all the experts agreed the island was essential to Mediterranean defense. To "hand it over to an unstable, though friendly, power at this moment," he said, "would undermine the eastern bastion" of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

ATHENS, July 28.—Foreign Minister Stephanos Stephanopoulos said tonight that Greece planned to bring the Cyprus question before the United Nations despite Britain's decision to grant a constitution to the Cypriots. He said the proposal was an improvement over that of 1948 but did not give Cypriots the right of self-determination.

Mr. MORSE. The article sets forth a typical British colonial policy. The policy seeks, by way of form, to recognize political rights in Cyprus, but gives the people of Cyprus no substantial control of their own political rights. The people of Cyprus will understand that. In the course of human events, the rest of the world will come to understand it, too.

I think the time is long overdue when the United States should stop supporting colonialism in this world as a part of its foreign policy. Likewise it should stop supporting the totalitarian practices of totalitarian states. It should answer the vicious, lying Russian propaganda by way of a clear demonstration of acts which would make clear to the world that we are not on the side of colonialism, and are not on the side of economic imperialism of any foreign power; but that we recognize that all human beings have a common denominator of human instincts, and that instinctively all people know that they are entitled to political freedom and self-determination.

Mr. President, I shall continue to be critical of any foreign policy of my Government whenever I see such specific acts as we have noted in recent years that would justify the criticism that this country is allied on the side of colonialism.

I have mentioned Indochina. To repeat, my position has been all along that the part this country should have played—and we failed to take advantage of a great opportunity of leadership in this matter, in my judgment—was to have urged from the very beginning the declaration of a United Nations trusteeship in Indochina, based upon independence now—not tomorrow, not next year, but now—and a guaranty by the United Nations to the people of Indochina of their political freedom now. What a rocking back on the heels that would have produced, so far as Russian propaganda in Asia is concerned. It would have been a clear demonstration that we meant it when we took our stand on the side of the self-determination principle as it was written into the San Francisco Charter which became the Charter of the United Nations. But apparently we were afraid to offend the French. Apparently in our foreign policy we were not willing to stand up against the mate-

rialistic aspirations of the French and take a clear and strong stand on the side of human rights. What a different situation would exist in Indochina if such a trusteeship had been supported by the free nations of the world. We would have had Russia on the defensive in the battle between freedom and enslavement in Asia. But that is not the course of action we followed; and I think we muffed the ball at Geneva.

There was an opportunity for the American Secretary of State to assume the offensive against Russian propaganda. That was not the course of action which the Secretary of State followed. In my judgment, as a result of his course of action at Geneva, we suffered one of the greatest major defeats in all the history of American diplomacy.

In the early stages of that controversy, apparently the course of action the United States State Department wanted to follow was one of armed intervention in Indochina—to protect what? From the standpoint of the Asians, it would have been looked upon as a program to protect French colonialism in Indochina. That policy should have been discarded first. With that policy abandoned, and with the free nations among the Allied group then standing to protect the territorial integrity of Indochina, under a United Nations trusteeship, until free elections could have been held, and until the people of Indochina could have taken over their Governments for themselves and operated them by themselves, Russia would have been put on the defensive in Asia.

In my judgment, Russia will never come forward and stand up against the free nations of the world when they are willing to stand for united action, and when they stand for the kind of moral law I am urging here today, and which should be the warp and woof of American foreign policy. But I regretfully say that, in my judgment, that is not the situation today.

I close by saying that if we mean it when we say we wish to be an ally of freedom, we had better follow a different course of action in respect to protecting the freedom of Israel than we have followed during the past 14 months. If we mean what we say, then we had better make clear to the world that we can be counted upon to come to the assistance of free nations, because, in my judgment, the maintenance of their freedom is essential in the century ahead if freedom is eventually to survive in the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Objection is heard.

The call of the roll will be continued.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the

following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bowring	Hill	Reynolds
Byrd	Holland	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cooper	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Sparkman
Douglas	Long	Symington
Ervin	Malone	Upton
Flanders	Mansfield	Wiley
Frear	Martin	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BURKE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CORDON, Mr. CRIPPA, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GORE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than a few moments. However, I wish to point out to the Senate what the amendment entails. It means a reduction of approximately \$1,033,000,000 in the overall authorization for this program.

Although that would appear to be a reduction of about one-third of the new money, I should like to point out to Senators that it is a reduction of only 7.2 percent, just a little over 7 percent, of the overall amount now in the program.

If we grant the full amount requested under the bill, there will be on hand \$12,849,500,000. Based on the report of the committee, and referring to page 12 of the committee report, even the Foreign Operations Administration does not believe it is capable of spending this money much more rapidly than at the rate of \$5,500,000,000 a year. Therefore, looking at page 12 of the report, based on the Foreign Operations Administra-

tion's own estimate, we find that at this time next year they would still have left over \$7,360,000,000. In other words, Mr. President, based on the report of the Foreign Relations Committee itself, they would have on hand enough money to carry the program on for 2 years and 3 months, if my amendment should carry.

Mr. President, there is no need having money on hand that much ahead of time, or, to illustrate it another way, if Senators would just look at the committee report before them, and if they will turn to page 13 in that committee report, they will see a chart. They will see on the bottom line of the chart figures indicating the rate at which the Foreign Operations Administration has been able to dispose of funds under this program.

They will see, Mr. President, that during the first year of the program Congress appropriated around \$5 billion, and they will further see that it was 3 years before the Foreign Operations Administration was successful in disposing of the first \$5 billion appropriated by the Congress. But during that same period of time the Congress appropriated twice that amount of money, so during the first 3 years the Congress appropriated three times as much money as the Foreign Operations Administration and its predecessor could dispose of during the first 3 years.

If Senators will look at last year's expenditure, which is shown at the end of the dotted line on page 13 of the report, they will see that we have already on hand enough money to carry the program for another 2 years. I insist that it is terribly wasteful to give any organization appropriations to the extent of \$9,749,000,000 more than it can spend in the next year. I am not saying that we should not give away those weapons to our friends and allies, but I do say that if we want to give arms away, there is no requirement that we appropriate the money as much as 3 years in advance.

The statement is made in the report that lead time is involved, and that the money is required to be on hand in advance, so as to make sure that the guns, tanks, and other weapons are constructed.

I say to Senators that the weapons we are giving away under this program are weapons which require the shortest possible lead time. A type of weapon which takes a long lead time is the latest type of jet aircraft. The latest type of jet aircraft requires several years from the time it is on the drawing board until it begins to roll off the production line. However, we are not giving away our latest type jet aircraft to our friends and allies.

Let us look at the kind of equipment we are giving to Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa. He does not even have the oldest model American jet airplane. We give our allies the older type of equipment, and weapons of a second rank. We give them the type of weapons that are not in the greatest need here, and it makes good sense to do it that way. We have such weapons available generally on much shorter notice.

I point out to Senators that this program has never been restudied and reconsidered. If that had been done, the same thing would have happened to this program that happened with regard to the military base construction program. Senators will recall that during the first year of the Eisenhower administration an enormous reduction was made in the Air Force requests for airplanes. We spent for airplanes during that year even more than we spent during the previous year. The spending for military construction was even more than it had been during the previous year. Nevertheless, the fact remains that there had been such an excess in appropriations remaining from prior years that the administration was in the position that it did not need to ask for as great an appropriation during that year, even though it actually spent more money on defense than its predecessor administration had spent.

Mr. President, I believe that some new Members of the Senate would be interested to know that since the end of World War II we have given to our friends and allies in the world a grand total of \$45,510,000,000. That amounts to approximately \$1,000 for every family in the United States.

Our debt today, in terms of purchasing power, is as great as that of all the nations of the world combined. Yet we shall be asked to raise the debt limit before this session of Congress ends.

I urge Senators to adopt the same philosophy with respect to spending money to help our allies that the Committee on Finance has very soundly adopted with regard to raising the national debt limit. What is that philosophy? It is the philosophy advanced by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who argued in that committee that we should not raise the debt limit until it had been proved it was necessary to raise it.

If my amendment were approved, according to the committee report, on page 12, the second from the last paragraph, there would be on hand \$6,360,000,000 of unexpended money at this time next year. I say that because on page 12 of the committee report there is an estimate that there will be on hand \$7,360,800,000 if the full amount is appropriated.

Why does the Foreign Operations Administration have this amount of money on hand? I believe I can tell Senators the reason. The reason is that we had a program which entailed obtaining agreements with our allies before we gave them arms and equipment paid for by the Treasury of the United States. However, our administrators had difficulty in negotiating such agreements with our allies. Therefore, if we look at the chart on page 13, we note that they were not successful in spending in the first year of the program 10 percent of the money given to them. It will be noted also that at the end of the second year they had not been successful in disposing of more than 30 percent of the money given them during the first year. However, that did not keep them from asking for money at an ever accelerated pace.

Why did they not, at the end of the first year, come to tell us that they could not get rid of the first \$5 billion, and that they still had \$4 billion on hand at the beginning of the second year? Why did they not come to us and tell us at the end of the second year that they were not able to get rid of the \$10 billion they had on hand, and that they had been able to get delivery of only a little more than \$2 billion?

It is because they advanced the philosophy that if they could not get rid of all the money in 1 year they should double up on the amount to be spent in the next year. They were faced with the fact that they were unable to make their program move as fast as they wanted, and to give away money at the rate of \$5 billion a year. At the same time, we have been continuing to appropriate money at an ever accelerated pace.

With regard to our own military program, the Secretary of Defense made the discovery that money had been requested too fast with regard to air bases. He reduced the appropriation for air bases, and we had a fight on that point on the floor of the Senate, and the Secretary was upheld.

The Secretary of Defense found that he had money far in advance of requirements for acquiring airplanes. Thereupon he reduced his request for new appropriations for that item.

Such reappraising has not been done in connection with this program. The committee has furnished a chart which proves that to be the fact. There will be on hand next year \$7 billion. There is no item in the program that we cannot acquire if we reduce the program by a billion dollars as of now.

What I should like to have done is to have the same savings and economies and replanning effected in connection with this program that we have seen applied to our own defense program. I should like to point to one example of the failure of replanning in connection with the expenditure of taxpayers' funds. That is in connection with Indochina. If Senators will look at pages 253 and 254 of the hearings, they will note that General Stewart told the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] that he had no idea how they could possibly dispose of the \$800 million provided in the bill for Indochina. He did not know what they would do with the money.

I do not have this information directly, but I do have it on good hearsay, and I will be interested to hear a statement on this item by the committee. The fact is that today we have on the docks in Indochina, still in the crates, approximately \$450 million worth of equipment which has never been taken from the crates in which it was shipped to Indochina. That is not to mention more than \$1 billion worth of equipment already in the hands of the French and Vietnamese, or the equipment that was funneled first to France and then into Indochina. In addition, there is \$600 million worth of equipment in the pipelines, on its way to Indochina. In addi-

tion, \$800 million is provided in the bill for Indochina.

No war is going on in Indochina now. A truce has been signed. The terms of the truce pledge both sides to free elections. I have yet to hear one American expert tell me that he expects us to win those free elections. Therefore we can anticipate that on this whole program we may lose all of our expenditures, and our enemies may receive the full benefit of our enormous investments in that war.

There was some consideration being given to the fact that we should not spend the \$600 million that has already been appropriated, and that we should not spend the \$800 million requested in the bill. By how much did the committee cut it? The committee cut the \$800 million by \$72 million. They should have taken out the whole \$800 million. They should have also asked for a reprogramming of the \$600 million that was left over.

Let us take a look at Europe. According to the chart on page 19 of the committee report we have already given Europe in direct defense assistance and defense support \$17 billion worth of arms. There is no war in Europe. European countries are not using the machine guns, rifles, tanks, and planes that we have given them. There is no fighting going on there at all. I have had occasion to visit some of the enormous ammunition depots in Europe, stocked up sufficient for months of heavy fighting. They already have on hand \$17 billion of American equipment.

That is not the end of it. There is \$5,683,000,000 unexpended and \$2,527,000,000 unobligated for Europe. Why would there be \$2,527,000,000 unobligated for Europe? My best guess is that funds have been held back in the hope that some day France would ratify the European Defense Community and then we could use some of the \$2,500,000,000 to arm the Germans. That would be a good project, but why should additional billions of dollars be authorized awaiting something that may never happen? If we are able to ratify the European Defense Community, that will be a good time to take a new look at the whole program and see what else we could give those people. I point out that already we have on hand enough to keep the program going for another 2 years at the maximum rate of expenditure that has ever been reached.

In addition to the \$5,683 million for Europe, there is also on hand for Europe \$360 million for defense support, making a total amount of money for Europe, unspent, of approximately \$6 billion already. This bill provides another \$900 million. Certainly the program can be restudied, and reductions can be made.

In this program approximately \$20 billion has been spent to the present date for arming our friends and allies. Most of those arms are still on hand. At the present time there is \$9,500 million still left on hand, and even if my amendment carries, there will be left almost \$12 billion of unexpended funds. Think of it, Mr. President. That is two-

thirds of the amount of money spent under the entire Marshall plan over a period of 5 years. If this bill is passed, even with my amendment, there will be on hand, unexpended, two-thirds of the entire amount of money provided under the Marshall plan for the reconstruction of all Europe.

Senators will recall that when we undertook the Marshall plan we would not put such enormous amounts of unobligated appropriations in the hands of any administrator. We required a careful year-by-year check to see how much money had been spent and how much money was still needed. That program was carefully reviewed and checked year by year.

I regret to say that Congress has lost control of the program. It is completely beyond our control. Yet Senators, in all good faith, not wanting to be criticized for reducing defense spending, have found themselves voting year in and year out for the highest possible figure for our allies.

Let us see what happened last year. An amendment offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana to reduce the program by \$500 million came within four votes of carrying. What do we find this year? The Administrator now has on hand \$9,749,500,000. If my amendment had carried last year, the administration would now have on hand \$9,249,500,000. Would not that be difficult? Think what a difficult task would be imposed on him to operate his agency with a surplus of only \$9½ billion, just enough to carry him for 2 years. Would not that be unfortunate?

Mr. President, that is the program we have before us. The administration has not been able to spend all the money. The wars have stopped. The situation has changed. There is a truce in Indochina. But does that cause our officials to slow down the rate of spending? No. They say, "Give us every possible bit."

The Appropriations Committee has examined some of these generals. They were asked, "What will you do with the \$800 million when the war ends in Indochina?" They said, "We can reprogram the money." Yet every program they have already has adequate funds for more than 2 years and 3 months. When they reprogram, all they can do is to project the program another year or two further in advance.

When enormous piles of dollars are made available to administrators, the effect on them is to chastise them for the fact that they could not get rid of the money any faster than they did. It is discouraging to anyone who is trying to economize and save the taxpayers' money.

It also places our allies in a very advantageous position. They know that our administrators are on the spot, because they have not been able to spend all the money. The result is that if our allies hold back and drag their feet a little, American officials will extend even more cooperation and let them have things even more their own way.

I recall that when I was in France there was a great furor because the

French had understood that they were to have a contract to produce approximately \$600 million of American military equipment each year. It seemed as though the Foreign Operations Administrator was not going to give them quite that favorable a contract for the employment of French labor. They were somewhat doubtful that they would accept any of our money if we did not extend the contract to produce more of the equipment in France. That is the sort of situation we get into.

I regret that the late Senator Taft of Ohio is not with us today, because I recall so well how many times he stood on this floor and eloquently argued for a reduction in the rate of foreign-aid expenditures. I recall that the junior Senator from Louisiana voted with the Senator from Ohio in every one of those attempts. Generally speaking, he was only trying to reduce the program by 10 percent year by year.

In those cases the Administrator was able to show that, if we did not give him that 10 percent, it would mean a slowdown of the program. There is no such showing here. There is money enough to operate the program for more than another year. If Congress wishes to step up the rate of expenditure, it can step it up next year. There need be no slowdown when there are more than 2 years' funds on hand.

One of Senator Taft's last statements to the press was that he felt we would either have to stop this program or to reduce it drastically, because he felt that the public would not stand for it much longer.

We have seen complaints about the cost of our farm program, and yet my understanding is that all the losses actually sustained in our farm program to this date do not amount to much more than \$1 billion.

If this amendment carries, a slowdown and a careful study of the amount of money that is being spent could mean the saving of as much money as the entire American farm program has cost the American taxpayers in 20 years.

If we are to reduce this program, I submit that the time to do it is before the Appropriations Committee reports to the Senate. It is contemplated under the law that when Congress authorizes these programs, the authorization bill should be passed before the Appropriations Committee acts. In the haste with which we must act, the Appropriations Committee has not been able to wait for the authorization. It has had to go ahead and act on the appropriation. At least we would be in position to instruct the committee that we believe it should insist upon some economies and upon a careful study of the whole program, particularly a study of what will be done with the hundreds of millions of dollars entailed for Indochina, amounting to a gross of more than a billion dollars, which now must be reprogrammed, to see whether we should appropriate all of that great amount of money.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I should like the Senators to remember that this is—

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator will remember that the other day the Senate voted—I think 86 to 2—for an amendment which I offered, to increase the technical-assistance appropriation for Latin America. I wonder how the Senator's amendment would affect the amendment which was approved the other day, and how consistently one might support the Senator's amendment after having supported the amendment to increase technical assistance to Latin America.

Mr. LONG. My amendment does not at all affect the technical-assistance program. My amendment applies to titles I, II, and IV of the bill. The technical-assistance program is title III of the bill. I believe the technical-assistance program has been carefully studied. As the Senator well knows, there has been much criticism of the economic aid portion of the bill. Therefore, that portion has been carefully scrutinized and cut down.

On the other hand, everything under the military program has been rushed ahead, and billions of dollars have been provided in excess of that amount which would be spent in the next 2 years.

With regard to the amendment of the Senator from Florida that would not at all be affected by the amendment I am offering. My amendment applies only to titles I, II, and IV. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida applies to title III, and provides for a mere \$10 million. I am talking about billions of dollars.

I wish to point out that this program will not save this Nation. Much of the program is of a psychological character, designed to encourage our allies to resist in the event they are attacked. The weapons we shall be providing will not be modern weapons or the latest weapons. In the main they will be weapons which our armed services do not have in short supply. There will be no need to cut back on the production of any weapons which any of our allies may want.

If Senators will turn to page 10165 of the RECORD, they will find that the Comptroller of the Department of Defense testified before the Committee on Appropriations that the Army already has on hand \$2 billion more than it needs. So if there is any worry in the mind of any Senator that we might produce tanks, guns, or aircraft more slowly than we should, I simply point out that the Army already has on hand \$2 billion more than it needs, according to the statement of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense.

Furthermore, there is more than a 2 years' supply of cash on hand ahead of time for this foreign-aid program.

In the main, the program is one which contemplates that any effort to subjugate or overcome a friendly power must be by a major Russian effort, instead of by internal subversion. No matter how much we give to our allies—including the \$20 billion already given, the \$9 billion now on the way, and the \$3 billion requested in the bill before the Senate—there will still be an overwhelming power

on the Russian side, in the event Russia chooses to start a war.

The type of armament to be provided under this program will only make it possible for our allies to put up some effective resistance, so as to make it necessary for the United States to consider its position before Russia could subjugate those powers.

This military program only makes it inevitable that if Russia starts world war III, it will start the war by a direct attack on the United States of America, rather than starting the war against some foreign power which could be quickly overcome, but only by raising the probability that the United States would go to war against the aggressor.

Any nation planning a major aggression against the free world must realize that it must destroy the productive and fighting power of the United States. If that could be done, the aggressor then could easily overcome and destroy all the other nations. In fact, many of them would not fight because they would know they would be quickly brought to their knees.

In the long run, it will be found that the only nation which will save the United States is the United States of America itself. This program does not reduce the essential expenditures necessary for the defense of this country. Our generals and admirals who testified for the program stated at the inception that the foreign-aid program would not reduce the defense requirements of this Nation. It is nice to have our allies armed; but in the last analysis no one but Americans are going to save the United States of America.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to. I am positive that it will not mean a slowdown in the rate at which we can supply arms to our allies. I believe it will result in a careful restudy of the program, and will result in a saving of money. I do not believe the amount of the saving can be foreseen at the moment, but I am certain that it will be in the interest of the taxpayers of the Nation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wish to make reference to a statement which I understood the Senator from Louisiana to make to the effect that the Committee on Appropriations was not diligent in checking up on the foreign-aid expenditures. Expenditures are what count and not appropriations or authorizations.

In the 1953 fiscal year, for all purposes, the United States spent \$5 billion for military and economic foreign aid. In the last fiscal year which has just ended, \$4,800,000,000 was spent. The present fiscal year rate of expenditures, as estimated by the Bureau of the Budget is \$5 billion.

The \$5 billion is made up of \$3,500,000,000 which is to be appropriated this year, and \$1,500,000,000 carried over from moneys which have been previously appropriated. This means that \$5 billion will be expended from the Treasury of the United States. What affects the American taxpayer is the actual amount of money being paid out of the Treasury.

There will be collected from the American taxpayers this fiscal year some \$60 billion. There will be expended on foreign aid, military and economic, in this fiscal year, \$5 billion or one-twelfth of the total collections.

This use of one-twelfth of the Treasury income insures that if the United States is engaged in a war, American soldiers will not have to do all the fighting, but that there will be men of the free nations fighting along side of them. In my opinion, the war will not begin in the United States as our good friend, the junior Senator from Louisiana, would imply. The United States may be attacked. I agree that the attack may be from the air. But as to the fighting on the ground, I want it to be as far away from the United States as it can be, and I want help to come from every free nation in the world.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. First, may I say to the Senator that I make no reflection upon the members of the Committee on Appropriations; but I believe every Senator has some responsibility.

I ask the Senator from Arizona if it is not true that there is already on hand \$9,500,000,000 which in itself is almost enough to carry the program for another 2 years.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. That money, as the Senator knows, is not available for expenditure now. It is committed under a long-term program. I am speaking of money which will be paid in the next fiscal year from previously appropriated funds. That is \$1,500,000,000.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In the funds which we are discussing, is it not true that there is about \$2,700,000,000 which is not even committed as of this date, and that of the funds committed \$700 million is committed to Indochina—a proposal which should be restudied?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no doubt about that. The Committee on Appropriations is now considering what to do about the money programed for Indochina.

But the junior Senator from Louisiana figures there is \$2,500,000,000 uncommitted. The Committee on Appropriations is considering estimates which provide that \$1,500,000,000 will be committed next year, and that requests for \$3,500,000,000 of new money be appropriated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senate apparently is about to vote, but I have not heard from the distinguished leadership of the majority party as to what their basic position is on the amendment now being offered by the Senator from Louisiana, or what their reply is to the very cogent arguments which he has been making.

In times past, I have heard speeches similar to that which the Senator from Louisiana has just made, but they have, however, come from the other side of the aisle. It is interesting to see some reversals in the roles.

I am now wondering whether the other side of the aisle agrees with the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana, or whether they are opposed to the amendment.

I therefore rise to ask unanimous consent if I may be permitted to ask either the eminent majority leader or the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations as to what the position of the majority party is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to respond to the inquiry. I heard the distinguished Senator from Louisiana speak this morning, and I heard him speak again this afternoon, quoting figures and debating the question to a considerable extent. I told him that I admired his energy, but I can assure the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the President of the United States has spoken very authoritatively against the amendment, as also have General Gruenther and Admiral Radford.

I quote the President:

For the new program I urge that the Congress authorize new appropriations to the President in the amount of approximately \$3,500,000,000. This amounts to approximately a 40-percent reduction in 2 years. Further reductions in the authorized program at this time, in view of the continuing threat to our national safety—

I emphasize that—

in view of the continuing threat to our national safety, would be unjustified and unsafe. Because the new program is in larger measure a continuation of existing programs, its success requires reauthorization for expenditure of funds that are still unexpended.

Mr. President, I heard this morning and I heard this afternoon about all the money which the Senator said was unexpended. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana realizes that when an airplane is built or when a warship is built it is not paid for, according to the contract, until the money is due.

The Senator called attention to the fact that while there was \$9,749,500,000 unexpended as of June 30, out of the total amount, there was only \$2,604,000,000 which had not been obligated. How much has been obligated in the last 30 days I do not know, but "all the world is a stage." We have certainly seen dynamic situations recently which called to our attention the importance of this matter.

When the President of the United States, who is a great general, and Admiral Radford and General Gruenther tell us that this program is necessary to be continued in the interest of the United States, who am I to hold back, especially after the Foreign Relations Committee voted almost unanimously, with only two dissenting votes, to sustain this program?

We did cut the program to some extent. We cut it from \$3.5 billion to \$3.1 billion.

I could repeat a number of the arguments which were made this morning, but that would only take time. I wish to state this amendment would add a new section imposing an overall ceiling

of \$2,066,000,000 on authorizations for title I, Mutual Defense Assistance, title II, Development assistance, and title IV, Miscellaneous Programs. As approved by the committee, for those three titles appropriations of \$3,196,772,000 are authorized. Of this amount \$228,300,000 is for items for which no appropriations are requested within this fiscal year, so that so far as fiscal year 1955 is concerned the authorization in the committee bill is \$2,968,472,000. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], however, is not limited to fiscal year 1955. It would, therefore, make a reduction of \$1,130,772,000, or more than 30 percent. A reduction of this magnitude would result in a complete change in the character of this program. It would make impossible the carrying out of many of the activities specifically provided for.

Mr. President, something has been said about Indochina. I know the Senators many times do not listen to speeches of other Senators, but time and time again I did speak on this subject, and I referred to it when I opened this debate. In that speech I called attention specifically to a letter I received from the Secretary of State on the very issue of Indochina. Of course, the letter resulted from an evaluation of the world situation in the Far East. I shall read the letter again, so that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana may understand what I said before, and what the Secretary said.

This is a letter of July 22, 1954. I wish to say that what caused me to ask for this information was the changed situation in the Far East.

The Secretary addresses me as follows:

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: You have asked me whether in my judgment the signing of armistice agreements regarding Indochina diminishes the need for funds requested for the area of southeast Asia and the western Pacific in the mutual-security legislation now before the Congress.

I believe that the armistice does not diminish the need for these funds. If anything it increases the need to have available funds with which to build the defensive capabilities and strengthen the resistance of the free nations in the area.

Mr. President, let me say parenthetically that we have the executive branch of the Government speaking, which branch, under the Constitution, has the authority and the power to speak in terms of foreign relations. This is the Commander in Chief speaking through his servant, in relation to what is needed for the defense of this nation.

I continue:

When I appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee during the hearings on this legislation and discussed the need for funds in this area, the possibility of a settlement of the nature which has now taken place was already foreshadowed. As you will recall, when I testified as to the importance of having a flexible fund to build strength in this region, I emphasized the need for it even should such a settlement occur and I believe this was also held in mind by members of your committee. In my estimation, the gain which communism has now established in this area should be a warning to all the people of the region as well as to ourselves of a need for a determined effort to preserve their freedom. I believe no one can now foresee exactly how these funds will be used.

However, their availability will be essential for the success of plans now under way. In the event that unforeseen circumstances prevent the efficient expenditure of these funds for the purposes of strengthening the area against further Communist encroachment, they will of course be held unexpended for future disposition by the Congress.

For these reasons I believe it is a matter of grave importance to the national interest that these funds be available and I trust that the Congress will see fit to authorize and appropriate them.

In the discussion the other day, as was brought out by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, several comments had been made in relation to equipment and materials, and so forth. I should like now to make a statement which I believe answers some of the hypothetical statements—which is all they are—made in relation to this matter.

Several questions have been asked on the floor during the debate on this mutual security bill about the equipment and materials which we have furnished in the Indochina war. I wish to give the best answers which I can to these questions. I have discussed these matters with representatives of the Defense Department and the State Department, and I feel sure that I can provide the Senate with satisfactory answers to all the questions which have been asked.

First, the question has been asked whether all possible steps are being taken to prevent the equipment which has been furnished by the United States to defend Indochina from falling into Communist hands? The answer to this question is "yes." I am informed that all further shipments of equipment to Indochina have now been stopped, and shipments on the high seas have been diverted elsewhere. With regard to equipment which is already in Indochina, the situation is this. General O'Daniel—"Iron Mike" O'Daniel—the chief of the United States Military Assistance Advisory Group in Indochina, is working very closely with General Ely, the commander of the French forces in Indochina. The French have assured us that they are determined to prevent military equipment from falling into the hands of the Communists, and that they will evacuate from northern Vietnam the maximum quantity of military matériel which it is physically possible to remove under the circumstances. General O'Daniel is satisfied that the measures which the French are taking and plan to take in the future will afford adequate protection. As you know, the terms of the armistice agreements in Indochina allow 10 months for evacuation of forces and their equipment from areas which will be eventually controlled by the Communists.

Now, the second question which has been asked has to do with the legal situation regarding military equipment which has been furnished by the United States. I am informed that the facts are as follows: Title to military equipment passes to the receiving country when we deliver it to the receiving country. That is, in the case of equipment for the French in Indochina, title passes when we deliver it in Saigon or when it is placed aboard a French ship for transport to Indochina. On the other hand,

even though the French have title to the equipment which has been delivered to them, that equipment was furnished to them for the purpose of defending against Communist aggression. They have signed an agreement with us that when the equipment is no longer needed by them for the purpose for which it was furnished they will offer to return it to us. Therefore, we have the right to work out with the French the disposition of the equipment which is now in Indochina. Negotiations with the French are now underway.

It should be pointed out that several possibilities are open with regard to the disposition of this equipment. Some items excess to continued French needs in that area may be returned to the United States for appropriate disposition by this Government. Some items may be turned over by the French, with the consent of the Government of the United States, for use by the Governments of Cambodia, Laos, and free Vietnam in the defense of their territories. The precise quantities of equipment and materials which will fall into these several categories remains to be worked out in the months ahead, as circumstances develop in that area.

Everyone should be aware that on many of these matters, answers more precise than the ones I have just given cannot be given. The situation in Indochina is a brandnew one. The ceasefire agreements are susceptible of various and sometimes conflicting interpretations. We do not know in detail what the plans of the independent Governments of Cambodia, Laos, and free Vietnam will be. We do not know what role the International Truce Commission will play.

What we do know is that the free nations of the world have suffered a setback in Indochina. It is true that the request for an emergency fund for Indochina was based on some assumptions which no longer are valid. But the vital thing to remember is that the situation is worse, not better, than it was then assumed to be. The President has asked for an emergency fund to deal with the whole problem of the defense of southeast Asia and the western Pacific. We should not deny him that means of coping with the dangers and problems which lie ahead in strengthening that area against any further advances by communism.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator from Illinois wish to ask a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the very eminent Senator from Wisconsin whether he agrees with the statement of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that the administration is planning to spend next year on foreign aid approximately the same amount as in

past years, namely, approximately \$5 billion?

Mr. WILEY. Let me say that of course when there is a pipeline, there is difficulty in getting deliveries started; but once the start is made, the volume of deliveries increases. For example, only today or yesterday I heard a statement that some of the jet planes we authorized in 1951 for delivery to Turkey are just now being delivered. In other words, once the authorization is made and once the pipeline is established, some time must pass before the deliveries are actually made—in this case to the Turks. We have to authorize the appropriations and make the appropriations well in advance of the delivery dates.

Having that situation in mind, and considering the approximately \$3 billion which we propose to authorize for appropriation at this time, we expect the balance will come out of appropriations we have heretofore made. I think the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is substantially a correct one.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield to me at this point, for a question—and if the Senator from Illinois will permit me to ask a question at this time—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly, if the Senator from Louisiana wishes to ask a question.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true, based on the chart on page 15, that this administration is giving away money twice as rapidly as the Truman administration succeeded in giving away money in connection with the same program, in the last year it was in office? I ask that question because in the last part of the Truman administration, they succeeded in giving away \$2,500,000,000 under this program, whereas the present administration has, under this program, been giving away money at the rate of \$5 billion this year.

Mr. WILEY. I think—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether that is a fact.

Mr. WILEY. Let me say that once a manufacturing operation has begun, there is greater efficiency as time passes and as greater experience is had in the operation.

In this case, it is possible to do a better job after the operation has been well begun. So the deliveries are now reaching the maximum, if that is what the Senator from Louisiana means.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is what the Senator from Louisiana has said actually true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg pardon, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes, Mr. President, I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Wisconsin agree that the Senator from Louisiana has made a correct statement in view of the fact that it seems to be borne out by the chart appearing

on page 15 of the hearings? I refer to the point made by the Senator from Louisiana, to wit, that whatever may be the authorizations, the present administration is now spending on foreign aid at a rate approximately twice that of the last year of the Truman administration.

Mr. WILEY. In making that statement, the Senator from Louisiana is not placing the matter on a fair basis. This administration is now paying for what the Government contracted for in the last years of the preceding administration. The articles are now being placed in the pipeline and delivered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for another question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the request for the present authorization is approved by the President of the United States, and that the White House is opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Illinois has asked a double-barreled question. I would say the President is opposed to any substantial cuts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana proposes a cut of \$1 billion. Therefore, is it correct to say that the President of the United States is opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask whether the Republican policy committee is opposed to the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WILEY. I assume it is opposed, although I am not a member of the policy committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me to state that in times past, as the Senator from Wisconsin is well aware, I have supported the foreign-aid program, both under the Truman administration and under the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; and I honor the Senator from Illinois for it. I, too, have supported the foreign-aid program under both the Truman administration and the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know that, and I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for it.

I have given this support because I have believed we had to have allies; that in the case of Europe we needed to build up the economic health of those countries; and that in the case of certain countries, we needed to provide arms. Let me say that I also believe in the technical assistance program for the people between Cairo and Singapore as a practical way of demonstrating Christian friendship and in the process helping win friends among the neutral and uncommitted third of the world. However, I have been placed in a very peculiar situation in my own State of Illinois, in that after having supported the Eisenhower foreign-aid program last year, I was then attacked by virtually every Republican leader in my State and was denounced for my program of

supporting the Eisenhower foreign-aid program. The Republican leaders who denounced me for that include some of the leaders who now seem to be in great favor at the White House.

Mr. WILEY. Has the Senator from Illinois asked me a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. So I wish to make certain, this afternoon, where the White House stands on the program. If the White House favors foreign aid, and is opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], I think the White House is taking a correct position—much as I love the Senator from Louisiana.

However, do you think it is quite fair for me to be put in the position of diving into the water to help save the child of the administration, and then, when I get to the shore, to have the administration and the Republican leaders say, "That is not our child, and you are wasting our money"?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, that is a wonderful question, and I agree with it. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was asking the question of the Senators on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. WILEY. In response to the question of the senior Senator from Illinois, let me say that, on the subject of the foreign-aid situation, the Senator from Illinois and I have seen a great many matters eye to eye. Let me also say that I have been condemned by some of my own Republican brethren for some of the same things for which the Senator from Illinois has been condemned. However, in that connection I may refer to the statement made about a famous Democrat: "We love him for the enemies he has made." I think that statement is applicable in the case of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I glory in those enemies. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Yes. So now we have on this floor a demonstration of the American way. We can disagree.

I wish to make a little clearer my position on this matter, because I respect the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. I realize that anyone who keeps his eye on the dollar at this time is very much honored in the United States; he is supposed to be one who thinks in terms of saving the ship of state. However, in my humble opinion, as was said earlier today by a distinguished Senator, the money we are spending on this program constitutes the best insurance-policy premium we can pay to save America. If we do not spend this money abroad, we probably shall have to spend 10 times as much in preparing our national defense within our own borders—although of course that is a matter of opinion. Yet that opinion is based upon the statement of one of our great leaders in the military field. His statement was made before our committee.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at this point, for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for a question; but the Senator from Louisiana must admit that I have been very patient to-

day, for I have listened to him make the same speech twice. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Wisconsin agree that it is a good idea to know what our money is to be spent for, when we appropriate it by the hundreds of millions of dollars? Does not the Senator from Wisconsin think it is a good idea for us to know precisely what our money is to be spent for?

Mr. WILEY. Of course I do.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin agree with me that in carrying out the program, \$600 million of appropriations have been made for Indochina, although the Senator's letter has explained that those funds or goods purchased with them will not be sent to Indochina; and \$800 million of new appropriations are now proposed to be authorized for Indochina, although in the Senator's letter it is explained that that money, or goods purchased with it, will not be sent to Indochina?

Mr. WILEY. I fully agree that we can get a bill of particulars. We got one last night. We can get a bill of particulars every time about the future. If we could look into the crystal ball and see what is going to happen here or there, we could tell exactly where we were going to spend the money. The Secretary's letter says that. We do not know what will happen in the Far East tomorrow, because the Kremlin is pulling the strings. We do not know what will happen anywhere, but we must be prepared, and appropriate money at the proper time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a reply to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] in defense of the administration?

Mr. WILEY. I love the Senator for that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend from Louisiana [Mr. Long] that although we have lost out in northern Indochina, and although the elections may turn against us in the rest of Indochina, we have not given up the struggle to keep southeastern Asia free; so we are trying to create an alliance of those people and other nations in that part of the world to keep communism out of Thailand, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, the Philippines, and so forth. So I think it is proper that there should be an uncommitted authorization which can be used for these purposes if the administration is successful in negotiating such a treaty.

I am delighted to defend the administration on this point. I regret only that our good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has been left alone, as he so often has been, to defend the administration on the other side of the aisle. The good Senator from Wisconsin has carried the burden for the administration and for the cause of world peace, and he has had nothing but kicks and cuffs from his party for his pains.

I should like to say that the Senator is a great American and deserves the thanks not only of his country, but of his party; and if his party will not thank him, I, at least, will do so from this side of the aisle.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an interruption? I wish to help my distinguished colleague [Mr. WILEY] for a moment, and answer what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The entire membership of the Foreign Relations Committee supported the bill. Furthermore, the Republican policy committee is supporting the bill. The

Senator from New Jersey has been fighting for the bill for months.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Just a moment.

I ask unanimous consent for the insertion in the RECORD of pages 10, 11, and 12 of the committee report, with the

tables of balances that have been discussed so much.

There being no objection, the pages, together with the tables, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

5. UNOBLIGATED AND UNEXPENDED BALANCES

The committee thoroughly examined the amounts unobligated and unexpended from previous appropriations, which the bill carries over. The following table shows these balances as of June 30 last year, with estimates for June 30 this year and next year:

Unexpended and unobligated balances

[In thousands]

Category	June 30, 1953		June 30, 1954		June 30, 1955, unexpended balance (estimate)
	Unobligated balance	Unexpended balance	Unobligated balance (estimate)	Unexpended balance (estimate)	
Grand total.....	\$2, 115, 400	\$10, 061, 100	\$2, 604, 300	\$9, 749, 500	\$7, 360, 800
Title I—Mutual defense assistance:					
Chapter 1—Military assistance:					
Sec. 103. General authorization.....	(1)	(1)			
Sec. 106 (c):					
(1) Europe, includes facilities assistance.....	(1)	(1)	2, 043, 200	5, 683, 100	
(2) Near East.....	(1)	(1)	167, 600	761, 500	
(3) Far East.....	(1)	(1)	254, 500	1, 067, 700	
(4) Latin America.....	(1)	(1)	34, 700	58, 700	
Sec. 104. Infrastructure.....	(1)	(1)			
Sec. 105. Development of weapons of advanced design.....	(1)	(1)	27, 000	50, 000	
Total, chapter 1.....	(1)	(1)	2, 527, 000	7, 621, 000	5, 587, 400
Chapter 2—Southeast Asia, the western Pacific and direct forces support:					
Sec. 121. Southeast Asia and the western Pacific.....	(1)	(1)		590, 000	
Sec. 122. Production for forces support.....	(1)	(1)		165, 000	
Sec. 123. Common-use items.....	(1)	(1)			
Total, chapter 2.....	(1)	(1)		755, 000	701, 400
Chapter 3—Defense support:					
Sec. 131 (b):					
(1) Europe.....	(1)	(1)	37, 500	360, 060	
(2) Near East, Africa, and South Asia.....	(1)	(1)		124, 300	
(3) Far East and Pacific.....	(1)	(1)		130, 600	
Sec. 132:					
(a) Korean program.....	(1)	(1)		160, 000	
(c) United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.....	(1)	(1)	10, 700	10, 700	
Total, chapter 3.....	(1)	(1)	48, 200	786, 200	662, 600
Total, title I.....	(1)	(1)	2, 575, 000	9, 162, 200	6, 951, 400
Title II—Development assistance:					
Sec. 201 (a):					
(1) Near East and Africa.....	(1)	(1)		72, 200	
(2) South Asia.....	(1)	(1)		65, 000	
(3) Far East and Pacific.....	(1)	(1)		24, 700	
(3) American Republics.....	(1)	(1)		2, 000	
Europe (coal and steel loan).....	(1)	(1)		100, 000	
Total, title II.....	(1)	(1)		263, 900	224, 300
Title III—Technical cooperation:					
Sec. 304. Authorization.....	(1)	(1)		164, 500	
Sec. 306. Multilateral technical cooperation:					
(a) United Nations Technical Assistance.....	(1)	(1)		700	
(b) Organization of American States.....	(1)	(1)			
Total, title III.....	(1)	(1)		165, 200	136, 700
Title IV—Other programs:					
Sec. 403. Special assistance in joint control areas.....	(1)	(1)			
Sec. 405 (a). Movement of migrants and refugees.....	(1)	(1)		5, 900	
Sec. 405 (c). United Nations Refugee Emergency Fund.....	(1)	(1)			
Sec. 406. Children's welfare.....	(1)	(1)			
Sec. 407. United Nations Relief and Works Agency (authorization only).....	(1)	(1)	29, 100		
Sec. 408 (a). North Atlantic Treaty Organization.....	(1)	(1)			
Sec. 409. Ocean freight charges.....	(1)	(1)		700	
Sec. 410. Control Act expenses.....	(1)	(1)			
Sec. 411. Administrative expenses.....	(1)	(1)		6, 900	
Total, title IV.....	(1)	(1)	29, 100	13, 500	48, 400
No fiscal year 1955 request:					
Escapes.....	(1)	(1)		5, 100	
Basic materials.....	(1)	(1)		18, 900	
Sec. 550 sales.....	(1)	(1)		117, 000	
Special projects.....	(1)	(1)		2, 200	
East German food.....	(1)	(1)		1, 500	
Operation Reindeer.....	(1)	(1)			
Total.....	(1)	(1)		144, 700	
Recapitulation:					
Military assistance.....	1, 930, 500	8, 479, 000	2, 527, 000	7, 621, 000	5, 587, 400
Nonmilitary assistance.....	184, 900	1, 582, 100	77, 300	2, 128, 500	1, 773, 400
Grand total.....	2, 115, 400	10, 061, 100	2, 604, 300	9, 749, 500	7, 360, 800

* Breakdown not available due to different fiscal year 1954 appropriations structure.

The more significant figures in this table are not those of the unexpended balances, but those of the unobligated balances. The difference between the unobligated and the unexpended funds, which amounted to approximately \$7 billion on June 30, 1954, represents appropriations which have been obligated but not yet spent. The goods have been ordered, and they will have to be paid for when delivered. This balance of \$7 billion in obligated but unexpended funds, therefore, is not available for any other use.

The unobligated balance of \$2.6 billion represents funds not firmly set aside against a specific contract. Most of them, however, are definitely committed to specific programs, even though those programs have not yet advanced to the stage where the funds can be said to be obligated within the strict definition of that term insisted upon by the General Accounting Office.

In explaining the unobligated balances, Mr. Stassen stressed two factors which contribute to this situation. The Administration does not make firm programs until funds have been appropriated. After receiving its annual appropriation, programs are agreed upon with recipient countries and agreements negotiated to effectuate the programs. This process usually takes several months and sometimes longer. For example, before obligations for aircraft procurement for a recipient nation can be made, that nation must be prepared to receive the aircraft. This may involve technical training for its crews, lengthening of its runways, establishment of repair centers and similar advance work. Jet aircraft delivered to Turkey this year, for example, were paid for out of funds appropriated in 1950. These funds were at first unobligated and then unexpended, but if they had not been appropriated when they were and carried over from year to year, the Turkish jet air force planned in 1950 would not have come into being.

The Administration witnesses also pointed out that a certain level of unobligated balances would be desirable in any event to give flexibility in meeting new situations.

The great bulk of unobligated and unexpended amounts are in the funds for military assistance. This is the so-called pipeline created by time-consuming programing, contract negotiations, and long-lead items. For such complicated equipment as tanks, airplanes, and radar equipment, this production lead time runs as long as 2 or 3 years.

The Indochina situation, which required a considerable amount of transferring and re-programing during fiscal 1954, has also contributed to the amount of unobligated balances.

The chart on page 13 shows that expenditures are continuing to rise steadily while obligations are leveling off.

Particular attention is called to the inset which illustrates the fact that expenditures during 1953 far exceeded obligations, as more contracts became payable and fewer new contracts were let. This trend is expected to continue even stronger during 1954-55. The result is a shrinking of the unexpended balances. It will be noted that on June 30, 1953, the unexpended balances were \$10,061,100,000; on June 30, 1954, \$9,749,500,000; and on June 30, 1955, they will be an estimated \$7,360,800,000. As new appropriations and obligations are reduced, the pipeline in future years will become progressively less.

The committee felt, nevertheless, that a certain amount of water could be squeezed out of the unobligated balances and the requested new authorizations, taken together. After careful consideration of the varied factors involved, it reduced the total of new authorizations for which appropriations will be sought at this session of Congress from 3.4 to 3.1 billion dollars. The committee does not believe either the unobligated balances

or the new money can prudently be reduced further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now that the Senator has said that the Republican policy committee supports the bill, that the President supports the bill, that the Department of Defense supports the bill, and that the Foreign Relations Committee supports the bill, will the Senator come to Illinois and tell the Republicans there all about the facts of life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will rent a hall for the Senator so that he may do it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am ready to go there.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as was stated, the President of the United States supported this program, and he said that it was essential to the efforts of the United States in the field of international relations and national defense.

I believe that reductions such as those proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are unwise and unsafe. Such a serious reduction would serve notice to our friends abroad that the United States is not really interested in helping to build the joint defenses of the free world.

It is imperative that we hold the line now. This amendment would seriously cripple the MSA program. It would make it impossible to carry out many of the plans which the administration has developed.

I repeat, as President Eisenhower said:

We have chosen to build defenses with our allies rather than go it alone because we are convinced that this course is more effective and less costly.

The President then substantiates the statement of the great general that this is a less costly procedure.

Mr. President, I spoke for an hour at the opening of the debate of this program. It is very apparent that some folks did not hear my speech, nor did they read it. I made two points. One that I stressed particularly was that when we began this program the idea was to rebuild the morale and the economic structure of our allies. We have succeeded in doing that. But in doing so we stopped a depression from coming upon this country, a depression which had been prophesied by men in high places and by great economists, on the basis of the experience after the First World War, when a depression did come.

We hear talk about pouring money into ratholes. This is not money poured into ratholes. It provides credit, which creates a demand upon the production plant of this country. It creates a demand upon the labor of this country. It puts money into the hands of the laboring men so that they can create a demand again. That is what happened, to say nothing about the fact that we have staved off a third world war.

I have heard a great many statistics given today. I shall not reply to all of them, but I invite attention to the fact that we are always talking about our allies falling down. The significant

thing is that since 1950 we have appropriated \$15.3 billion for our western allies. These funds, in combination with those put forward by other NATO countries, have led to the expansion of the NATO general forces.

What did the other countries put in? They put \$43 billion into their own defense, and we are talking about doing the whole job.

I am as much in favor of saving money as is anyone else.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. Just a moment.

I like to save money as much as does anyone, and I think I have as high a concept of trusteeship as anyone else.

When I came to the Senate I could not even continue my law partnership because I felt I could not serve two masters. I dissolved the law partnership. This job has had my full time.

Among the important functions of this job is the duty of seeing to it that when we spend a dollar belonging to this Government we should get value received. Value received does not consist merely of material value; it consists of preserving the great economic values, spiritual values, and political values of a nation.

Mr. President, that is what these programs are for, and in my humble opinion, despite all the closed-mind reasoning, in spite of all the isolationist tendencies, I cannot believe that we can close our eyes to the fact that this world has been shrunken by the ingenuity of man until it is a very small place.

Only the other day I used the illustration that when I was flying to Panama several months ago it required only 8 hours, but my previous trip to Panama required 5 days.

When my mother came to this country as an immigrant before the Civil War she was 6 weeks on the way. Yet only a few months ago a man crossed the ocean in a little more than 4 hours.

While I was flying to Panama, a man flew from Los Angeles to New York in less than 4 hours, indicating that this little globe of ours has been shrunken. With that has come, I trust, eyes that are open so that we can respond to that which is necessary to be done. So, Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I heard a very scholarly discussion of world affairs on Sunday by Mr. Howard K. Smith, the head of the CBS news gathering service in Europe. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin also heard it. The theme of Mr. Smith's discussion was the great betterment in many conditions affecting friendly nations, which he thought had resulted in large measure from the help which we had given them.

I recite some of the things he mentioned. First, in Britain, he said, there was the highest level of prosperity that had been found there in many years. He said it was the first time in 14 years that Britain had been able to stop rationing.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. With reference to France, he remarked on the cessation of hostilities in Indochina and the fact that that would greatly relieve the budgetary burden of the French and would at once bring about better feeling there.

He spoke, of course, more directly about Indochina and the fact that funds which we had destined for that faraway place would no longer be needed there.

He spoke of Iran and the fact that within the past few days a settlement had been agreed upon between the Iranian Government and the former British owners of the oil concessions there for the settlement of their troubles and for the renewed production of oil.

He spoke of the Suez settlement and of the fact that it would remove from the British the heaviest single burden they have carried in recent years. I believe he said that some eighty-thousand-odd British troops had been maintained in the Suez Canal fortress up to this time, and that such forces would be withdrawn beginning almost at once.

He spoke of the fact that it was an open secret that a settlement of the Trieste dispute awaited only the drafting of certain documents, and that such settlement would not only bring about relief from tension, but would reduce confusion and create greater economic stability.

He spoke of the fact that whereas Yugoslavia on the one hand, and Greece and Turkey on the other, had not been very friendly until recently, they are now at the point of executing a Balkan alliance which, he said, should be a highly stabilizing factor.

It seems to me that that statement points up the fact that the money we have been spending has been doing some good, and it may point up the fact also that it is now possible to begin to reduce, and reduce rather heavily, our spending.

Mr. WILEY. Which we have done in this bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has not made up his mind what conclusion is the more logical at this time. Mr. Smith in his broadcast was merely reporting factually on the situation as he saw it.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, the chairman of the committee which is handling the bill, to comment on these real betterments in world affairs which were so ably listed by Mr. Smith, and to comment on the effect of those betterments upon the program which is embodied in the pending authorization bill. Is it the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that we now have an opportunity to make a sizable reduction along the lines that have been suggested by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], or along some other lines; or is it the view of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that we should at least maintain the level of the foreign operations program which is embodied in the pending legislation in order that it may continue to be effective? I should very much appreciate an expression in some detail by the distinguished Senator from

Wisconsin upon the question to which I have invited his attention.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very happy to respond to the challenging question. First I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for a very fine résumé of what might be called the constructive steps that we have taken.

Very often, in evaluating what is taking place, we have a tendency to look on the negative side, and very often we have the tendency to complicate our thinking, instead of simplifying it. The Senator from Florida has given a résumé of the many fine results which have been accomplished.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to continue with my answer to the question of the Senator from Florida. First let me say, with respect to the help that has been given by us, that the program was started with \$7.6 billion in 1951. It was then reduced to \$6 billion, then to \$5 billion, and then to \$3 billion.

That gives an indication of the fact that, as Europe builds up its military defenses, the military part of the program can be reduced. There is no question that the economic part of the program is also being reduced.

I am satisfied—and again I must say that I cannot look into a crystal ball—that unless there appears on the world stage some eruption of a very serious nature which would take Europe into the maelstrom of war, next year we can make an additional reduction, as we have done this year. We have curtailed the program by 40 percent during the past 2 years. That is a great reduction, from a total of \$8 billion to less than \$3 billion.

I am satisfied that unless the Kremlin executes another of its so-called tactical utilizations of satellites, we can probably reduce the program again next year. Eventually—because to a large extent many of these countries are really becoming self-sustaining—it will mean that the opening up of trade among themselves, enabling Europeans to get rid of their tariff barriers, will result in an improvement in their health. Of course, those are dreams which depend on the attitudes of a great many people, and no one can foresee the future. However, I am sure the Senator from Florida entertains the hope that we shall see a little brighter sunlight than we see now.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has been hoping, with his friend from Wisconsin, not only that we would see more sunlight, but that we would be able to reduce the burden of the program in the very near future. I understand the Senator to say that some reduction as compared with last year is embraced in the authorization bill now pending before the Senate.

However, what has disturbed the Senator from Florida has been the apparent fact that approximately \$1,400,000,000

is admitted to be unallocated in this authorization measure. Although it was designed for use in the Indochina area, it is apparently being held in reserve for any need that may arise in that area. Is the Senator from Florida correct in that understanding?

Mr. WILEY. I am informed that the major portion of it is programed, but not obligated.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, \$2½ billion has not been allocated. The Senator from Florida knows it, and the Senator from Wisconsin knows it.

Mr. WILEY. It is all programed.

Mr. MAYBANK. It has not been obligated.

Mr. WILEY. What is that?

Mr. MAYBANK. It has not been obligated.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. It has not been obligated for anything. It is now being programed. They are programing a university for Ethiopia. If the Senator from Wisconsin does not know it, I know it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, that is not in the bill before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield so that I may reply to the statement of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the \$2½ billion to which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] just referred is in a bill lying on the table. I do not think we are discussing that item in connection with this bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. This is the authorization bill to carry on the building in Ethiopia, and the Senator from Minnesota knows that there is \$2½ billion that has not even been obligated. We are adding by this bill some \$3 billion to the \$2½ billion that has not been obligated, making an additional \$7½ billion that has not been spent. Is that correct?

Mr. THYE. However, that is an entirely different item from what we are discussing here.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that it is not in this bill, because, of course, this has not been obligated. It has not even been passed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, we are discussing this bill, and if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield to me further—

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to keep the record straight. This bill adds to that which has not been obligated and which is now before the Appropriations Committee, on which we held a hearing this morning.

Mr. THYE. However, that is technical assistance, an entirely different program from that which we are discussing in connection with the mutual security bill.

Mr. President, I have sat here this afternoon and listened to various figures being referred to in connection with different programs. I can only rise in defense of the Appropriations Committee,

on which both the Senator from South Carolina and I serve.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not saying an unkind thing against the Appropriations Committee. I am only giving the figures which the staff of the Appropriations Committee compiled for me, from which it appears that \$7½ billion has not as yet been spent.

Mr. THYE. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is \$2½ billion which it is planned to spend, for which planning has not been completed. This program is in addition.

Mr. THYE. The program to which the Senator and I were giving consideration this morning in the Appropriations Committee is technical assistance. This is mutual security.

Mr. President, we must take into consideration that mutual security includes orders for tanks and airplanes of various types.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. But the administration has not even obligated all the money we appropriated 2 years ago. I agree with what the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin said about the good we have done, but I must agree with the Senator from Florida it is about time to do some good for our taxpayers. There is \$10 billion which we have not spent.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In all fairness to the particular program embodied in the bill before us, if we are to have military equipment, we must first plan it, program it, obligate the funds, and then wait for the completion of construction of the equipment, whether it be a plane, an atomic weapon, a tank, a battleship, or a submarine. We cannot place an order today and expect delivery tonight.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that.

Mr. THYE. An order placed in 1951 is delivered in 1954.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I never suggested that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota was wrong about the obligation of funds. The point I wished to bring out was that we have \$2½ billion in another bill which we have not obligated.

Mr. THYE. That is in the technical assistance program and the general program which encompasses that type of assistance—welfare, health, and so forth.

Mr. MAYBANK. What is the difference?

Mr. THYE. This is the military program, and the other is technical assistance. The Senator can confuse me or even himself if he tries to combine these two programs in his thinking.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee—

Mr. THYE. Longer than I have.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I would not say that, but I am confused because there we find that \$7½ billion has not been

spent, \$2½ billion of which has not been obligated. Now we have another bill for \$3,400,000,000, and the President has the right to transfer these funds.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I read from page 14 of the report, which is the most concise and specific source to which we could possibly turn to try to obtain clarification of the question which has become so confused in the debate:

The total amount requested by the administration this year is the least of any year since the military-assistance program began in fiscal 1950, and is considerably less than half of the peak year of 1951 when appropriations reached \$7.6 billion. Since then, there has been a steady decline to \$7.3 billion in 1952, \$6 billion in 1953, and \$4.5 billion in 1954, with \$3.4 billion requested and \$3.1 billion authorized for 1955.

Let us take a look at the drop since 1950. At that time the figure stood at \$7,600,000,000, and now it is down to \$3,100,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course the Senator is absolutely correct. During the years for which he read figures, we were in the Korean war. Then we were in the Indochina war. We spent over a billion dollars on goods. The Senator knows that. General Van Fleet was before the committee the other day in executive session. I remember that he said on the record that he thought the \$800 million provided in the bill for Indochina ought to be used in a pool for other countries.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina knows the appropriations question very well, because he is one of the most able members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate what the Senator has said.

Mr. THYE. The Senator knows that during the height of the Korean crisis we were borrowing from the account which had been made available to the European theater in order to fight the war in Korea; and today we are fulfilling the obligations which the Korean war imposed upon this Nation because we borrowed from the European theater to fight the Korean war.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. Of course I am.

Mr. MAYBANK. I raised the point in the Appropriations Committee at that time that we were fooling the people by fighting the Korean war and not paying for it.

Mr. THYE. Exactly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Are we going to be fooled with respect to Indochina?

Mr. THYE. We borrowed from the European commitments to fight the Korean war, and we are today paying it back, just the same as if a housewife went to a neighbor and said, "Give me a bowl of sugar," and the next week she returned the sugar.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct, but two wrongs do not make a right. Now we are borrowing from the Indochina fund. The Senator knows that, too.

Mr. THYE. The Senator and I know the appropriations question because we

have lived with it for several years. I did not want the record to be confused to the extent that we did not clarify the point that we are today paying back some borrowed war merchandise which we took out of the European theater with which to fight the Korean war.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. I raised the point in the committee at the time, and I think the Senator did, also. In this bill are we going to borrow for Thailand and Burma from the Indochina \$800 million?

Mr. THYE. Today we are paying the bills that have been accumulating for 3½ years. That is one reason we see the authorizations dropping, but the financial cash outlay going up.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Only yesterday afternoon the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] offered an amendment to the bill providing for the payment of all the obligations in certain areas, as the Senator knows, so far as appropriations are concerned.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that we have an unused surplus of approximately \$9,500,000,000 at the present time, and that of that amount, approximately \$2½ billion is entirely unallocated or unobligated? In this bill is there not an additional \$3,100,000,000 which will make approximately \$12,800,000,000?

I listened a few minutes ago to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who spoke about a Mr. Smith broadcasting over the radio. Did the Senator hear that man say anything about our spending or giving away to other nations \$122 billion during the past 10 or 12 years? Did he hear him say anything to the effect that the United States has gone into debt by that much, and that we have increased our taxes by that much? Was there anything said at that time about that?

I should like to hear the Senator from Wisconsin explain the indebtedness which is being incurred at present, by giving our money away when we do not have it. We are going further and further into debt. Our national debt has become greater year after year.

So let someone speak sometimes about the United States, how it is going into debt, and how it owes twice as much as all the rest of the nations together. I should like to hear a little discussion along the line of our Nation's finances.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] can reply to that point when I have finished, if he wishes to. So far as I personally am concerned, I must say that the unexpended balance—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I did not think the Senator would care to discuss it. He does not care to discuss anything about the tax increases in the United States and about the debt this

Nation owes. Those questions are always dodged when Senators are speaking about giving money away. But they do not tell us how or where we are to get the money.

Mr. WILEY. I do not wish to be interrupted by the distinguished Senator, unless he desires to ask a question. However, I shall discuss the subject, since he has challenged me to do so.

The Senator has said we are going into debt. Yes; we are. But he did not mention the fact that the United States now has an annual output in manufactured goods of approximately \$380 billion. There was a time when the United States had a \$60 billion or a \$80 billion annual national income. Now the income of the United States is more than \$200 billion.

There is no need to become so wrought up, if we do recognize the facts as they exist. If I thought a marauder was about to attack my home, I would not hesitate to buy some pretty good ammunition and weapons with which to protect my home.

The mutual-aid program is a protective program. The Senator can talk all he likes about giving money away. But the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] showed the fruits which have been borne when he commented upon what he had heard broadcast over the radio by Mr. Smith, who described those fine results.

The peace which exists in the world today—it is not exactly peace, but at least what there is of it—is largely the result of the effort our country has made. I shall refer to statements to that effect made to me by two distinguished citizens of the world.

Some months ago a Japanese who held a high position in his government visited me in my office. I relate this incident because it corroborates what the distinguished Senator from Florida has said. He asked if I was the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I told him I was. I offered him a chair, and we sat down and had a conversation. He spoke very good English.

He said, "I have come to thank the American people through you. You know, when MacArthur went through the streets of Tokyo as a conqueror, millions of our people turned their backs on him. Why? Because they thought they had coming to them what our nation had always imposed upon a conquered people. We always applied the rule which the West applied: To the conqueror belongs the spoils."

"Weeks, months and years went by. But there was no spoliation. Instead, your country helped us to rehabilitate our people and our nation. You gave us faith. You brought us new ideas. You spent money upon us."

Mr. President, at about the same time I had a conversation with Chancellor Adenauer, who spoke in practically the same language.

He said, "When the Americans marched into Germany, we felt that they would apply the rule we had always applied: To the conqueror belong the spoils. But you did not commit spoliation. You encouraged us. You rebuilt our nation. You brought us a new view

of life and a new conception of the function of a conqueror."

Senators can discount this attitude all they wish to, but when history is written a thousand years from now, it may be that the people of that era will look back to this time and say that it was then that humanity finally turned the corner and started up the road toward peace. Perhaps this is the beginning.

Mr. President, one cannot tell from the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana what portions of the program would be eliminated or curtailed. Would the Senator from Louisiana reduce the amount of military assistance by a billion dollars? Would he stop the flow of arms to Greece and Turkey? Would he make it impossible to carry out the projected building of the defenses of Japan? Would he stop arms aid to our allies in southeast Asia, at the very moment when a southeast Asian defense pact is in process of negotiation, as has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Let me finish; then I shall be glad to yield.

Or would the Senator from Louisiana make the reduction in other parts of the bill? Would he eliminate the item for direct forces and greater support in southeast Asia, thereby having the United States withdraw from the most critical area of the world?

Would he stop relief and rehabilitation assistance to Korea?

There is no way of telling which of these vital programs would be affected by the amendment, but there is a certainty that some of them would be affected; and to do so would be to lessen the security of and increase the danger to the United States.

I appeal to Senators to reject the amendment.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator understand that the purpose of my amendment is to require the Committee on Appropriations to make recommendations for a reduction of the overall program? The committee should examine into the \$1,400,000,000 allocated for Indochina. That program has been canceled.

Mr. WILEY. Again, my answer to the Senator's question is very clearly set forth in the letter of the Secretary of State and by the executive branch of the Government, which say, "No."

The executive branch of the Government is spearheading the United States foreign policy. Many of us would like to be justices of the Supreme Court; many of us would like to be Cabinet secretaries—perhaps Secretary of Commerce or the Secretary of State. But we are legislators. I recognize the responsibility of a legislator, but that responsibility is not to spearhead the foreign policy of our Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me to rise again in defense of administration policy?

Mr. WILEY. I bow to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that northern Indochina was merely the immediate place where the struggle for southeast Asia was occurring; and that while the battle in northern Indochina has been lost, would it not be very mistaken for us, who have lost that individual encounter, to give up our own general policy? If we close southeast Asia, do we not lose India, because all essential rice would be shut off from India? If we lose southeast Asia, do we not probably also lose Japan, with Australia being threatened? Therefore, is it not rather fainthearted to "throw in the sponge" at so early a date, and to write off the entire effort?

Mr. WILEY. I think the answer to the Senator's question is a decided, "Yes." At least, I may say that I have been informed, as has the committee, that negotiations are now in progress to effectuate the security pact which the Senator has mentioned on several occasions; recognizing, of course, that if all of southeast Asia is lost, and with it India, also, approximately 500 million more human souls will be placed within the Russian orbit.

We cannot close our eyes to the potentialities of that situation. Consequently, again I say that the Senator from Illinois is precisely correct in supporting the administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I invite the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin to journey southward to the State of Illinois this fall, and make similar statements in my State?

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first I wish to say that I wholeheartedly approve of this much of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin: The program has produced good results. There is no question in the world about that.

But it seems to me that with a budget framed last fall and winter, and with all the improvements in the international picture which have occurred since that time, a few of which were mentioned by me a while ago, certainly there should be some approach to a reduction of authorizations in this bill; and that any failure to recognize the possibility of such reductions closes our eyes to the fact that there have been great changes in the world, which enable such reductions to be fairly made. I am not at all sure that the figure incorporated in the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana has been accurately evolved, or that it correctly states the exact amount by which the authorization should be reduced; but I am not willing to, nor will I, vote for a bill which was predicated upon a budget drawn months ago, and one which does not reflect in the slightest the great improvements which have taken place in the international picture, and the fact that large blocks of the proposed authorization were designed to be spent in a place where such expenditure can no longer be spent. It seems to me it is unrealistic not to recognize the fact that certain reductions can appropriately be made. I was hoping the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin

would give us some aid by suggesting what amount could be properly subtracted from the amount embraced in the authorization bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. The committee did cut the amount by \$350 million. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] went along with that recommendation, recognizing the situation about which the Senator has spoken. I thought the Senator from Florida was discussing a short time ago what the idea of the Senator from Wisconsin was about the future years. As I said, I cannot look into a crystal ball, but I think, if conditions continue, we shall be able to continue reductions. When it is realized that the authorization has been cut about 60 percent from the amount recommended when the program was started, it will be realized that a tremendous reduction has taken place. This year the committee cut the amount much below the figure recommended by the President. It seems to me that action alone would entitle the bill to Senate support.

Mr. HOLLAND. The committee cut the new amount about 10 percent. Meantime, since the cut was made, there has been a cessation of hostilities in Indochina.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; and according to the best advice the committee could obtain, that event has precipitated a dynamic situation. I might say the proposal involves only an authorization. I understand the House of Representatives has cut the recommended authorization and the appropriation. That is my information. The committee decreased the recommended amount. It seems to me the action of the committee represented the action of men working hard and seeking to ascertain facts on which to base their action.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to me the action of the House of Representatives in cutting the requested appropriation heavily below the authorization which reached the Senate is realistic and justified, and I only hope I may have the opportunity to vote for some such reduction in the present proposed authorization. I think the reduction of \$1 billion suggested in the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is too large a cut. I should prefer not to support so large a cut. But it does seem to me that a continuation of the authorization of a figure which was arrived at months ago, since which time the Indochinese war has come to an end, since which time the Iranian dispute has been settled, since which time the British withdrawal from the Suez has been arranged, since which time the settlement of the Trieste situation has been arranged, and since which time so many things have been done which tend to reduce the backlog of matters on which we must help, would be a failure to recognize those improvements in the world situation, and would not be realistic. I hope there will be some opportunity to vote for a reduction of the authorization which will be some-

what in line with improved conditions in many parts of the world.

Mr. LONG and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana. Then I shall yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Florida realize, when he speaks about the percentage of reduction, that if one looked at the gross appropriation provided for in the bill, which includes reappropriation of funds as well as new appropriations, the reduction made by the committee is less than 3 percent, or about 2½ percent, instead of 10 percent? When one looks at the overall picture, the recommendation of the Senator from Louisiana amounts to only about 7.2 percent of the overall program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that. I understand that we are reappropriating appropriations made in the past which have not been spent, some of which have been committed, and some of which have not been committed. I understand that in all probability all old appropriations are expected to be spent, and that the amount of the new authorization is based upon the full amount of the old appropriations being available. But it seems to the Senator from Florida that the \$1 billion cut suggested by the Senator from Louisiana is not justified, and he could not support so large a reduction.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Florida aware of the fact that during the entire Truman administration, based on the aid mentioned on page 13 of the bill, there was only about \$5 billion actually expended from 1950 up to January 1953, and that the present administration is now spending money in 1 year at a rate in excess of what was spent in 3 years under the Truman administration?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point, because I think the Record—

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from California in a moment. I invite the attention of my distinguished friend from Louisiana to the fact that the program is a bipartisan one. I have supported it under both Presidents. I think most of us who have supported the program have done so. I realize perfectly well that most of the supplies and materials bought and contracted for under the program were not supplied in the same year in which they were contracted for or agreed to be supplied. I understand a long pipeline is involved. So I do not prefer to measure it out in the way suggested by the Senator from Louisiana. Of course, I also realize that we are spending more money now because we have come to the point of liquidation of a great many orders placed, and commitments made in the past. However, the point I am trying to make is that it does not seem to me it is realistic to retain the authorization at the specific figure which was calculated months before important changes in the international situation took place.

I am not happy about the fact that the distinguished chairman of the committee, who has so ably handled the argument on the floor of the Senate, does not recognize the fact that this is an invitation to a reduction. The Senator from Florida would rather be led by someone who knows more of the details than he does, and who wants to see the program carried through by attempting to make an intelligent detailed reduction rather than a broadax reduction.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, I think the Senator has pointed out, in response to the argument of the Senator from Louisiana, that this is not a partisan question. Actually, the reason why the expenditures have increased is that the orders for materiel placed under the prior administration are now bills which are becoming due. When one goes to a department store and charges certain items, on the first of the next month he will get the bill. We are now getting the bill for materiel which has been in the pipelines of production. The tanks and guns and the planes are now being delivered. So that is the reason why the rate of expenditure has gone up.

As to the statement made by my good friend from Florida that conditions are improved, I disagree with that statement. I do not think conditions are improved in the Far East. Ten million more people have just gone beyond the Communist Iron Curtain. To me that is not an improvement. I think the situation is that while, for the moment, the Communists may have to digest their new gains, in southeast Asia they have taken over the Tonkin Delta area, one of the great rice bowls of the world, which will give them the weapon of food to use against the free nations of Asia. The fact of the matter is that the victory the Communists have won in the northern part of Vietnam will give them a springboard which, if the Communists decide to do so, will permit them to move on into Thailand, Burma, lower Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, or Malaya, and on the way to India.

So when the Senator from Florida says conditions have improved, I do not believe conditions generally have improved. The fact of the matter is that since the close of World War II, over 600 million people have passed behind the Communist Iron Curtain. That represents a rate of almost 100 million people a year. Certainly that is not an improvement in the situation vis a vis the Soviet world.

So when the Senator from Florida comes to the floor and says the committee did not give consideration to these changed conditions, I say that simply is not the fact. This matter was discussed for many hours. The same questions were raised in the Committee on Foreign Relations, a committee of which I am a member. I am sure the same questions were raised in the Committee on Armed Services, which also considered this bill, as to the funds which had been originally

allocated by the administration to Indochina.

Obviously the situation in Indochina has changed. That situation has worsened. But at least there still remain southern Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Burma, the Philippines, the free government of China on Formosa, the Republic of Korea, and Japan, all of which are in the danger sphere.

It has been testified time and time again before the committees of the Congress that if we look at this problem as one of collective security—which I believe we must do, because we are a nation of only 160 million people; and already, so far as the free world is concerned, the balance of power, so far as manpower is concerned, has passed into Communist hands. The only way we can hope to meet this threat is to have the other free nations of the world in Asia, Europe, and the Americas prepare to stand with us.

The testimony has made clear that the cost of maintaining approximately 10 divisions of native troops in South Korea, in Japan, in Formosa, or in Southeast Asia is only equal to the cost of maintaining one American division; just as in Turkey it is probably possible to equip perhaps 2 or 3 divisions for the cost of equipping 1 American division.

I am not proposing the idea that we shall have our allies alone prepared to stand up and oppose communism if communism decides to move again, but rather the idea that we, with our 160 million people, cannot bear the entire brunt of the defense of the free world.

Therefore, it is important, I believe, to encourage our allies in Asia and Europe and the Americas as well as to help defend themselves and, collectively, defend the free world, and to assist them in that undertaking.

I merely rose to say most respectfully, that I differ with the statement of the Senator from Florida, that the picture has improved in that great area of the world.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished majority leader. I am sorry he was not here when I made my original comments. Had the majority leader been here, I do not believe he would have made the statement he has just made.

I stated, for instance, that one of the improvements was that the British had just concluded their arrangement with the Egyptians, under which they were withdrawing some eighty-thousand-odd military personnel and many thousand civilian and technical personnel from the Suez area. That operation is stated to be one of the largest, if not the largest, drains now upon the finances of the British Empire. In that respect the necessity for that great financial drain will cease to exist.

I mentioned the fact that in Iran it has just been announced there has been a settlement worked out between the former owners of the oil concessions in Iran and the Government, and that such concessions are being put into actual operation. The production of oil is again taking place. That is certainly an improvement.

I notice here in this report that substantial funds are included for expenditure in Iran, with the statement that the expenditure must be continued until the oil dispute with the British has moved near solution, and I quote:

Until oil revenues actually become available, further needs for assistance of this type may develop.

That goal has been reached.

I mentioned also the announcement by the broadcaster whom I quoted—and I have found him to be the best informed on European affairs whom I have heard for years—that in Trieste the settlement had been arranged, that the papers were being drawn, and that the disputed territory was to be divided in a way reasonably agreeable to the Italians and the Yugoslavs, which means that the necessity for our maintaining heavy expenditures there soon will be concluded.

Of course, as to Indochina, whatever the distinguished Senator may say, there is no way for us to now reach those 10 million good people who are behind the Iron Curtain, who formerly were not behind it. There is no way for us to give them anything now.

Certainly it has been admitted on the floor here today by the distinguished chairman of the committee that there is a substantial sum—as I understand it, \$600 million of the new authorization, and \$800 million in the carryover—which was destined for expenditure, and which is to be held as a reserve. The statement that the Senator from Florida made was that there is a bettering financial situation, under which we are given every opportunity to make a reduction. It does not seem to me realistic to go ahead and pass on authorization on the basis of a request made many months ago, before these things developed, and moving out of a committee before these things actually developed.

I am disappointed that we do not have from the leadership some indication of the fact that the time has come when we can begin to reduce the load on our own people here in America.

I am the first to agree that in the event we work out a Southeastern Asia pact similar to NATO we may then have to embark upon a heavy series of expenditures, something like we experienced with reference to the NATO nations. But the fact that there is a reserve just held here in suspense of \$1.4 billion—which is what it will be—plus other funds which do not need to be expended for the various activities which I have mentioned, as well as more which could be mentioned, makes me believe we should realistically reappraise the situation and make some reduction in the authorization.

Up to now I have heard not the slightest intimation from anyone charged with the responsibility of carrying this bill or anyone speaking for the administration that this could be done. Again, I am not making this a political matter, for I stand with this administration on whatever is necessary in this field. I am disappointed that the administration has not come here with the statement that this changed situation does allow us to make a reduction.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We had Admiral Radford before the committee. We had General Gruenther, who is in charge of the EDC, before the committee, we had representatives of both the Department of State and the Department of Defense before the committee, to give the appraisal they had made of the situation. They of course recognized that the program they originally had for Vietnam, before the conference which led to the loss of the Tonkin Delta, was changed by that situation.

Nevertheless, I think that also underscores the delicate nature of the situation and requires an acceleration of the aid to the free people of Thailand, who are prepared to defend themselves and will need help to do so.

Burma, if she ultimately comes into the southeast Asian pact, will need help in order to help defend herself and to participate in collective defense.

The Philippines will need additional help, for they are on the route of the possible or potential Communist advance.

There is an opportunity to build up the forces in Japan, so that she can at least defend her home islands, and make it unnecessary to have American divisions there to defend Hokkaido and the other home islands of Japan.

The Republic of Korea can build up her forces so that the American divisions which are there may be withdrawn ultimately, and replaced, if necessary, by a mobile reserve.

The Republic of China on Formosa could accelerate its program, which is considerably behind its original schedule, and build up there a non-Communist force which, in the event of further Communist aggression, might ultimately be important not only to the security of ourselves but to the security of the entire free world.

All of these matters have been testified to by the responsible military authorities of the country and by the responsible representatives of the executive branch.

The chairman of the committee has already pointed out that over a period of years the reductions proposed are approximately 40 percent, compared to the amounts formerly allowed. Certainly the administration, as rapidly as it can diminish the expenditures, will be prepared to do so.

That is the best judgment and the best testimony of those who are charged with the responsibility of this program, who live with it day by day. Each morning they have to read the cables from Thailand and Cambodia and Laos and Vietnam and China and Japan. They are confronted with the problems which arise in the world. Those men, who deal with those problems hour by hour and day by day, feel that this authorization is necessary for the common defense.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not care to debate the subject further. I thank the majority leader for his comments.

I close by again expressing the feeling that it is not sound fiscal management

to proceed upon the basis of a bill framed upon hearings beginning in April, and a budget made last winter, in the face of known changes in the situation, without any apparent realization on the part of those steering the bill of the fact that there have been great changes in the situation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think I should make a brief statement on this particular amendment. I have great sympathy for the amendment. In fact, Mr. President, I announced last year that I was almost through with economic aid in this whole program. Economic aid has been very greatly reduced.

I invite attention to a fact which I think is of importance, namely, that under the Senate version of the pending bill \$2,897,982,000 is authorized almost exclusively for military purposes to aid our allies in Europe and elsewhere.

The total item under title II is in the nature of economic aid, but it also has a military effect so far as our allies are concerned.

Then in title III, which we used to call title IV, there is a much smaller item of \$131,528,000 for so-called technical cooperation.

I announced that in view of the fact that some \$9.6 billion was available—I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] correctly quoted the figure—and in view of the fact that between \$2.5 billion and \$2.6 billion of that amount had not been obligated, we ought to cut back this appropriation by about \$1.5 billion or at least a reduction of approximately \$1 billion more than was made by the committee.

I held that view very strongly. But when I began to look into this question to see what was involved, I confess that the cost of the military program, even with the NATO countries, ran far ahead of what, in our judgment, we thought it would be. In fact, the ink had not become dry on the treaty before we were asked to appropriate in money and in end items, defense items—surplus items as they were then called—more than \$2 billion. It was called surplus, but it was good material, put into good condition by our own money.

There was no plan made for NATO. There was no blueprint. It was only a dream in the minds of some of the military men, and some of the men on this side who called themselves statesmen. But we voted to enter into it. I did not vote for it. The appropriation for NATO was the only big one that looked as though it was even aimed to strengthen our defense and to add to the defense of what we call the free nations of the earth that I voted against, because I knew it was foolish. It was a foolish program because no one had any plan, no one had any blueprints, no one had anything except a wild disposition to go

forth and spend a great amount of money, make friends for our country, and scare the very life out of all our enemies in the world. So I thought the time had come to refuse an appropriation. I went into the matter fully, as I have said, Mr. President, expecting to offer to cut the appropriation somewhere between \$600 million and \$1 billion below the cuts which were actually made.

I found that we had been asked by the President and, of course, by all the departments that were interested, for a total appropriation for the current fiscal year of some \$3,676,000,000, in round numbers, of new money. The House had authorized about \$3,566,000,000, the House having acted first on the authorization bill.

I reached a certain conclusion. It may not be sound. I confess to much frustration in my own thinking in connection with the entire program, but I reached my conclusion, in view of the conditions that exist in Europe now—not next year but now—in view of the fact that France had not come into the EDC, that Italy had not come into the EDC, and, perhaps, could not politically take the necessary steps to ratify the treaty, in view of the fact also, Mr. President, that things were not going too well in Indochina, and that, although all our military experts told us that the so-called Navarre plan could not fail, because it was almost foolproof, it did fail. There is no need to debate why it failed, or whose fault it was. Perhaps it was ours in part, but I hardly think so. In any event, it would do no good to discuss it. Actually things did not go well in Indochina. Things are not going well in the Far East. They look a little better in the Near East, but they are not by any means secure. There is trouble in portions of the Near East which may flare up any day. It does not matter to me how many times we are told by the Department of State or by any other department of Government—and I am not critical of the State Department in this statement—that conditions are becoming better and that great progress has been made, the fact remains that world conditions, so far as peace and security are concerned, have not grown appreciably better, and we might as well face the facts as they are, because world conditions are precarious and most uncertain. In view of the conditions existing in the world I reached the conclusion that to have reduced the authorization by a billion and a half dollars would have served notice not only upon Europe, but upon all the world, that the United States was withdrawing from all we had done in the Far East, all we had done in Europe, and all we had attempted to do elsewhere in the world. It seemed to me we could not afford to take that chance. It seemed to me that to do so would be taking a gambler's chance, which the United States could not afford to take, whatever our misgivings may be and no matter how strongly we feel that we could appropriate a much smaller sum of money.

Therefore I said to the committee, as I said to the representative of the executive branch of the Government, that if we cut the authorization bill to not ex-

ceeding approximately \$3 billion in new money, I felt I could go along with it.

We did cut it. The House authorized \$3,566,908,000. We cut it down to \$3,100,000,000; \$10 million has been added on the floor for Latin American countries. I think that was a very wise decision by the Senate. Therefore we reduced substantially the amount of new money in the bill. That is what we are now asked to authorize.

It is true that there are two other items in the bill for which no appropriation is asked, which items are continued in the present authorization bill, one involving the Palestine refugees in the Near East, and the other the so-called infrastructure program, totaling \$228,300,000.

The new money being asked for in the pending bill as it stands at the moment is \$3,110,000,000.

If we cut the amount by another half billion dollars, perhaps we could get by, but if we cut it by a billion dollars, as I first thought we should cut it, we would serve notice upon the world that the United States at least was withdrawing so far as our NATO program is concerned, so far as all our efforts in southeast Asia are concerned, and so far as any protection in the Far East, in the Middle East, and in all of Europe is concerned.

Is anyone so confident that the world has suddenly become peaceful and secure as to justify the taking of that great chance?

I could not do so. I was unable to justify it in my own thinking. I said that if we cut the present authorization of new money to substantially \$3 billion for this year, which is about 40 percent less than it was 2 years ago, almost all of it being money for military purposes, I would go along with the program. I will go along with it, in the hope that we may at least give some encouragement to the world until we can see if our efforts are availing.

There was another very important consideration in connection with the bill. I am not critical of anyone operating the special new agency, because it does not make any difference to me who it is, but so long as there is a special new agency which operates all over the world and tries to find out how much money we can afford to spend in every country on the globe, we shall expend an enormous sum of money.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], a man of great ability and of great vision and wide experience in international affairs, as he served in the House on the Foreign Affairs Committee before he came to the Senate, and although a junior Senator, was placed on the Foreign Relations Committee, in agreement with many of his confreres on the Democratic side of the aisle, insisted upon placing in the bill another cutoff date for the new agency. Without such an amendment, I would not have been willing to go along with the authorization bill now before the Senate.

Let me repeat, so long as this new agency exists, so long will this bill involve

enormous sums. I say that because anyone can find a place on this globe to spend money.

Therefore, we said, as we said last year, that this new agency would go out of business on June 30, 1955; that 1 year would remain in which to liquidate the unexpended balances credited to the economic side of the ledger in the program; and that an additional year would be given to permit the liquidation of the military program authorized in prior appropriations and in this authorization bill.

We did it in the 1953 bill, but the House conferees objected. They may object again, but there will be an end to this program even if their objection prevails.

We did not propose to say that there should be no further military aid given to NATO or to any part of Europe or to any area of the world, but we did say that the military part of the program should be taken over by the Defense Department. We said also that all the point 4 program and other aspects of the economic program should be taken over by the State Department.

The State Department does not like that. Understandably, the State Department does not want to undertake an operating program. Nevertheless, we make the policies. The Congress writes the policies. Whatever the House conferees may now insist on, they are nevertheless writing an end to this program, if we cannot bring it to an end by June 1955, as this bill proposes. There is no doubt about the sentiment in the Senate to end this program.

Perhaps this program will not be greatly reduced, but when whatever it is placed in the regular departments of Government, such as the Defense and State Departments, those Departments will not be out looking for more places to give away money. They will have their own programs to care for, and they will present reasonable requests for the foreign-aid program.

Mr. President, I have stated why I have felt that, in the present disturbed and uncertain conditions in world affairs, we could not afford to say to our friends abroad, if we have friends, or to say to our allies, if we have dependable allies—and I hope we have—that the United States is serving notice upon them that we are withdrawing from this program, that we are quitting. A further billion-dollar cut in this program will be nothing less than a fire alarm which every country in the world will hear.

Mr. President, I have briefly indicated how I feel on this question. I find myself in the greatest sympathy with every effort to reduce this vast expenditure. Great progress has been made, and great progress is being made. With the policymaking power in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, if we say that regular establishments of Government must take this program over, whether the State Department altogether likes it or not, we shall really make it possible to cut the program down to a reasonable size.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has made an excellent speech. He spoke the truth when he said that agencies of the Government, regardless of what they may be—and I cast no aspersions on anyone—look to see how they can spend money. I understood the Senator to say that.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Now they are trying to find out what to do with the unexpended balance of this \$2½ billion.

I ask the Senator to do me a favor and to make my conscience clear. Is the Senator certain that the program will be cut off in 1955? The Senator says the House is expected to cut it off.

Mr. GEORGE. I said the Senate proposed last year that it was to be cut off June 30 of this year.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know that.

Mr. GEORGE. But it has not been cut off.

Mr. MAYBANK. Has the Senator any assurance that it will be cut off? There is available \$2½ billion, and the members of the Appropriations Committee are trying to find out how the agency intends to spend it.

Mr. GEORGE. We have the assurance that its termination is provided for in this bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. My fear is that the program will not be cut off, and I do not hesitate to say so.

Mr. GEORGE. I can see the Senator's point of view.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope the Senator appreciates my sincerity.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there is one other feature in the bill with which I wish to deal. A considerable sum of money is authorized for the Far East. Originally a big item was earmarked for Indochina. I do not know what other Senators think about it, but I do not believe there is much opportunity left to do too much good in Indochina itself. The bill gives to the President a large discretion in the handling of a considerable sum of money, and it does not require the President to expend that money in Indochina. It may be spent, as the majority leader has said, in Japan, the Philippines, Formosa, Korea, or Indochina. I have a great deal of faith that the President of the United States will not expend recklessly and needlessly a large sum of money in the Far East or in Indochina unless he is convinced that the conditions amply justify such an expenditure. The President has demonstrated that he is concerned with the size of our expenditures, our appropriations, and our whole budget. I have enough confidence in the President to leave in his hands the sum of money provided in the bill, although it is large. I believe that he will conserve that asset unless it can be used in the far eastern area to the advantage of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question.

Mr. LONG. As I understand, the Senator is concerned about the psychological effect on our allies of reducing the

appropriation. Is it not true that our allies themselves actually created the necessity for this reduction when they signed the truce in Indochina, inasmuch as the bill, as reported from the committee, contained more than \$600 million of old money and \$800 million of new money for Indochina, which will not now be spent there?

Mr. GEORGE. I am disposed to agree with the Senator. I think there is more than a psychological effect involved. I say with the utmost confidence that I do not think we can take a billion dollars out of this appropriation without destroying the hope of the world that we are any longer to "play ball" with the programs which we have undertaken. I do not know what the consequences would be. I agree that it might be that the agency could, with the unpledged balance in prior appropriations, operate with a lesser sum than the \$3 billion which this bill authorizes.

I hope the Appropriations Committee will scrutinize the appropriation bill with the utmost care, because every item making up the \$3 billion is authorization for not exceeding "X" dollars. So the Appropriations Committee is at liberty, and has the power, to reduce the appropriation even below the amount of the authorization. Indeed, the Appropriations Committee of the House reduced it below the \$3 billion which we are authorizing, and considerably below the amount authorized in the House bill. I assume that the Appropriations Committee will make some further reduction in this bill. Reasonable reductions, properly placed in the bill, cannot serve to frighten our friends abroad, and around the world, into believing that such reductions are intended to signify our disposition to withdraw from the security effort which we have been making in the interest of preserving peace.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that the failure of our allies to cooperate in rearming in the manner which we should have liked them to do may prevent us from spending as much money as we would otherwise spend? I have in mind the refusal of France and Italy to cooperate in the rearming of Germany, and the reluctance of Japan to raise an armed force of more than 150,000 men.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to quarrel with the position of the Senator from Louisiana. He knows how I feel about the matter. He knows that I feel that Congress should make all the reductions which can be made. I know the weaknesses in our foreign-aid program—or at least I fear I do. But we are now facing the fiscal year 1954-55 and we are facing a world in which conditions are anything but stable and anything but reassuring. I do not believe it would be wise upon our part to take so deep a bite into the present appropriation, or to make so deep a cut as to indicate that we are withdrawing. What the Committee on Appropriations may see fit to do under the authority which will be provided in this bill will not, I think, have the effect which I have indicated.

What I have tried to say to the Senate is that the provisions of the bill for the liquidation of the new agencies, and for the transfer to the Department of Defense of certain defense items and to the Department of State of economic assistance and such other items as we find proper to transfer in the future, would really be the first long step toward a final reduction of this vast program—and it has been a vast program, in my judgment. This will really make it possible to cut the appropriations again next year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Georgia knows of the very great respect which I have for him. It goes without saying that that respect pertains to his opinion on this particular subject, on which he has so very much information and so great a background.

Is it my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Georgia feels at this time that the \$1 billion additional reduction in authorization would be extremely unwise?

Mr. GEORGE. I do feel that way, in all sincerity. I first had the same views as have been expressed by my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana. I myself had the purpose of trying to reduce the amount of new money by about \$1,400,000,000 or \$1,500,000,000, in order to bring the amount of new money down to approximately \$2 billion. But I reached the conclusion that it would be too hazardous to do so, under world conditions as they actually exist.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask one more question, if I may do so.

Do I correctly understand the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Georgia to be that rather than attempt to make any reduction in the authorization bill, the Senator feels that any effort toward reduction should occur in the Committee on Appropriations, based on the facts available at the time?

Mr. GEORGE. I do think so. I have felt that way; and I feel also that the whole defense program should go under the Department of Defense.

Congress has told the American people year after year that the money which has been appropriated for NATO, for the Far East, and for our friends everywhere else in the world, was money expended for our safety, for our defense, for our security, particularly. Let us live up to that statement made to the American people, and make certain that the defense program will be placed under the Department of Defense and other established agencies.

Those agencies will have in view their own needs and necessities every time they come to Congress, and they will not be disposed to increase their requests for appropriations merely for the sake of giving them away. Rather, they will seek to conserve.

I have every belief that that is the view of the President. I have talked with him about the problem. I have every belief that though large power is given him, and a very large blank check is given him by the bill, it will not be

wasted in the Far East, but will be used only, as I have said, if conditions seem to him and his military advisers to justify the expenditure of that blank check, or any great portion of it, for the safety and security of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As always, it is a pleasure to listen to the distinguished and able senior Senator from Georgia, not only on this bill, but on other matters as well.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator, who is the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if he does not believe it is the intent of the Senate, and of Congress, that, come next June 30, the Foreign Operations Administration shall be abolished, and that any aid programs of a military or economic nature shall be carried on through the Department of Defense and the Department of State, at the specific request of the President of the United States, and on a limited basis in line with the objectives of the foreign policy of the United States?

Mr. GEORGE. I do. I sincerely believe that the Senator from Montana has made an exact and accurate statement. Furthermore, I believe that had the fight been made this year, it would have been possible to transfer such expenditures as were approved to the regular established agencies of the Government.

But rapidly changing world conditions, having ominous portent, at least in my mind, led me to believe that we should be content with the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Montana himself offered, which I supported, and which I shall heartily support as a conferee if I am named as a conferee on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that while the bill now before the Senate extends the authorization for the Foreign Operations Administration to June 30, 1955, in effect it carries out the unanimous sentiment of the Senate expressed last year that the military-aid program would be liquidated within 2 years after 1955, namely, June 30, 1957, and the economic-aid program would be liquidated 1 year after 1955, namely, on June 30, 1956, so that in effect, whereas last year 3 years were allowed in which to liquidate the military program, and 2 years to liquidate the economic program, we are doing the same thing this year, but the process is a little more costly?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has no assurance that they will be liquidated, has he?

Mr. GEORGE. Provision is being made in the bill that they will be liquidated.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have so provided time and time again.

Mr. GEORGE. No. We provided for it last year, but we are now carrying out what was written into the law last year, recognizing that perhaps conditions did not warrant such action at that time.

Mr. MAYBANK. We did not provide for a liquidation of the program in 1957, and it is the same Senate. The same Senate turned down the request of the Air Force, and the former distinguished Chief of the Air Force.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is quite right. I do not wish to get into another field.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Did I understand correctly the distinguished Senator from Georgia to say that he felt the program could perhaps be reduced by an additional \$500 million below the committee figure?

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps without hurting it greatly, but I do not want to take a chance on it. However, I am willing to support the Committee on Appropriations if, upon a careful review, it is found that it would be wise to reduce the program further by any reasonable amount, which would not indicate that we were withdrawing our support from our allies, and if such reduction would not jeopardize our own national security.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not intend to delay the Senate, because I know Senators have their minds made up. But, according to the discussion in the Committee on Appropriations, there is available a large sum of unobligated funds. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] called attention to that. Why cannot some of the unobligated funds be used in lieu of the \$2,500 million authorized by the bill? Is there anything to prevent that?

Mr. GEORGE. Nothing at all.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. GILLETTE (when his name was called). Having announced in the Senate that I shall vote against the bill on final passage, I now vote "present."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] would vote

"nay" and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—38

Anderson	Ellender	McClellan
Barrett	Ervin	Monroney
Beall	Goldwater	Mundt
Bennett	Gore	Potter
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Capehart	Langer	Stennis
Case	Lennon	Watkins
Clements	Long	Welker
Crippa	Malone	Williams
Daniel	Maybank	Young
Dworshak	McCarthy	

NAYS—48

Aiken	Hendrickson	McCarran
Bowling	Hennings	Millikin
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Morse
Burke	Hill	Murray
Carlson	Holland	Pastore
Chavez	Humphrey	Payne
Cooper	Ives	Purtell
Cordon	Jackson	Robertson
Dirksen	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Kuchel	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Symington
George	Magnuson	Thye
Green	Mansfield	Upton
Hayden	Martin	Wiley

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gillette

NOT VOTING—9

Bush	Frear	Kilgore
Duff	Jenner	Neely
Eastland	Kefauver	Schoeppel

So Mr. Long's amendment was rejected.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 168, after line 21, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 547. Reduction of authorizations: Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this act, such provisions shall not be construed to authorize the appropriation, for the purposes of titles I, II, and IV of this act, of amounts (exclusive of unexpended balances of prior appropriations authorized to be continued available under such provisions) aggregating in excess of \$2,599,000,000.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I can explain the amendment very briefly; I do not care to labor this matter with the Senate.

This amendment would reduce the overall authorization by \$500 million.

I should like to point out that if the bill is passed without the amendment, there will be on hand in the Foreign Operations Administration \$12,849,000,000. It is estimated by the Foreign Operations Administration that it cannot spend that much money next year, and that it will then have on hand \$7,360,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The FOA cannot even spend the money it has now. It already has \$7,500 million which has not been spent. The FOA has \$2,500 million which it has not even obligated.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from South Carolina is entirely correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The FOA is now going around the world, trying to find how to spend the \$2,500 million.

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. President, I know that some Members of the Senate have not had the frustration I have experienced in trying to have reductions made in the funds authorized and appropriated for the foreign-aid program. For the benefit of those Senators, let me explain what usually happens. When the authorization bill is considered on the floor, the members of the Foreign Relations Committee usually stick together, and say, in response to all suggestions for reductions in the amounts of the authorizations, "Leave it up to the Appropriations Committee." So one who favors making reductions in the authorizations thus usually has 15 Members of the Senate against him in the very beginning.

Subsequently, when the Appropriations Committee reports the appropriation bill on the same subject, the 23 members of that committee usually agree to stick together on the appropriations that committee recommends. So one who favors making reductions in the amounts is, from the very first, opposed by a total of 38 Senators.

Mr. President, I know that Senators are beginning to hear about these programs from their constituents. It may be that we are approaching a turn of the tide, a time when the people will wish to have Mr. Stassen instructed to reduce his program of expenditures.

It seems to me that when Mr. Stassen and other representatives of his organization appear before the various congressional committees and seek to have billions of dollars added to the funds already available for their program, it would be a good idea if Mr. Stassen were told to determine where reductions could be made, instead of having the Appropriations Committee recommend all the appropriations requested, without receiving from the FOA any advice in regard to the making of reductions.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I see the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] on the floor. Let me say that in the committee some of us fought with him all yesterday afternoon, in an attempt to have a slight reduction made in

the appropriations under the authorizations provided by the pending bill. However, the FOA seeks to have an additional \$800 million added to the fund for next year. Is not that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yet the FOA already has \$2,500,000,000 which it does not know how to spend, although the expenditure of that money has been authorized by the Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the logic and the English of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana are better than his arithmetic, for I wish to point out that a number of the members of the Appropriations Committee already have voted in favor of his amendment proposing a cut of \$1 billion; and I am sure that a number of the members of the Appropriations Committee will vote in favor of his pending amendment, which proposes a cut of \$500 million in the authorization. So, instead of having all 38 members of the 2 committees—the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee—oppose his proposal, he will find that a great many of the members will vote with him on this question.

Furthermore, let me point out that if the Senator from Louisiana is unsuccessful in the fight he is making for reductions in the authorizations carried in the pending bill, I am sure that cuts will subsequently be made in the appropriation bill, anyway.

Mr. LONG. My point is that among the membership of those two committees, there are a number of Senators who normally oppose any reductions proposed in the amounts recommended by those committees. So I was glad to see that the Senator from South Dakota was among those who voted in favor of the reduction proposed by my amendment which was voted on just a few minutes ago.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, the members of those two committees—even though they may favor making such reductions—are oftentimes bound, as a matter of committee procedure, to go along with the amounts agreed to by a majority of those committees.

Mr. MUNDT. I may say that in the Appropriations Committee we have such friendly relations with one another that the members are not prohibited by any protocol or other restriction from voting in favor of reductions, if they believe reductions should be made.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, let me assure the Senate that if my remarks were understood as being in any way critical of the Appropriations Committee, I certainly did not so intend them.

I desire to state that the pending bill carries actual authorizations of appropriations which everyone has now agreed will not be made. For example, the bill authorizes an appropriation of \$800 million for Indochina. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee wrote to us a letter in which he clearly stated that the \$800 million will not be spent, in view of the truce in Indochina and, I suppose, because free elections there may result in

having the Communists acquire the arms we have there already. In addition, the fact that \$600 million already appropriated for arms for Indochina will not be spent for that purpose, means that a total saving of \$1,400,000,000 can be made in the items authorized in the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment, on page 168, after line 21.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I cannot let some of the statements made by the Senator from Louisiana go unanswered. In the first place, he said the Foreign Operations Administration now has on hand \$7,360,000,000 in cash. It is true that as of June 30, that amount was unexpended. But it is obligated and contracted for; and as the merchandise is contracted for, as has been said many times before this afternoon, it sometimes takes 2, 3, or 4 years before it is delivered.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made a wonderful statement in opposition to the proposed reductions in the authorizations, and regarding why he is standing by the bill.

Mr. President, the criticisms made of the Foreign Relations Committee are absolutely unfounded, in my opinion. In referring to the work of the committee, I do not speak of the work done by its chairman; but I say without fear of contradiction that all the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee are most sincere and honest in going very thoroughly into all the matters which come before the committee. In that respect, the work of the committee is outstanding.

Let me say that in answer to the argument of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I produced data supplied by the Government. He says, "\$800 million is available for Indochina and we are authorizing some \$600 million more."

I produced a letter from the Secretary of State, and I think it was entirely substantiated by the statement of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], when he told about the serious situation in the world today.

We have cut the program some 60 percent from what it was when it was initiated, and in the last 2 years we have cut it 40 percent, and this year we have cut it \$350 million, which cut occurred after the Indochina incident.

Yet the Secretary of State says in his letter:

I believe that the armistice does not diminish the need for these funds. If anything, it increases the need to have available funds with which to build the defensive capabilities and strengthen the resistance of the free nations in the area.

So I say, Mr. President, that when the President of the United States, when General Gruenther, the Secretary of State, and Admiral Radford, say that the amount included in the bill is needed—and, after all, the President of the United States through these officials, spearheads the foreign relations, and they know something about the world

situation—when they ask for it, and say that it is needed, I, for one, shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 41, voting "present" 1, as follows:

YEAS—45

Anderson	Goldwater	Maybank
Barrett	Gore	McCarran
Bennett	Holland	McCarthy
Bricker	Jackson	McClellan
Butler	Jenner	Monroney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Potter
Chavez	Kennedy	Russell
Clements	Kerr	Smathers
Crippa	Langer	Stennis
Daniel	Lennon	Watkins
Dworshak	Long	Welker
Ellender	Magnuson	Williams
Ervin	Malone	Young

NAYS—41

Aiken	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Pastore
Bowring	Hendrickson	Payne
Bridges	Hennings	Purtell
Burke	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Carlson	Hill	Saltonstall
Cooper	Humphrey	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Kuchel	Symington
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Mansfield	Upton
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Millikin	

VOTING "PRESENT"—1

Gillette

NOT VOTING—9

Bush	Frear	Neely
Duff	Kefauver	Reynolds
Eastland	Kilgore	Schoeppel

So, Mr. Long's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

GREETINGS TO MR. AND MRS. KAPUS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that we have as our guests in the gallery today some very important visitors. They are Mr. and Mrs. Geza Kapus and their 8-year-old daughter, Eva. They are the first escapees from the Iron Curtain who have received visas under the Refugee Relief Act.

Mr. and Mrs. Kapus, who escaped from Communist Hungary under incredible difficulties, are now on their way to Midland, Tex., where they will begin life anew. The heart of Texas will surround these fine people, and I know America will be better for their presence in our country.

Mr. President, I hope they will stand. [Mr. and Mrs. Kapus and their daughter, Eva, rose from their seats in the gallery, and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in welcoming the Kapus family to America and to our State of Texas.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

CEASE FINANCING NATIONS RECOGNIZING COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 547. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or continued available pursuant to this act shall be used to furnish assistance under any such provision to any nation which has formally recognized, or has established diplomatic relations with, the Chinese Communist regime, until such nation furnishes assurances satisfactory to the President that it no longer recognizes, or maintains diplomatic relations with, such regime.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a motion?

Mr. MALONE. I would be happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. President, some days ago I filed a notice of motion to reconsider with reference to an amendment which the Senator from New Jersey put into this bill.

I now ask unanimous consent that the motion for reconsideration may be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to deny further foreign-aid funds to those governments which have formally recognized Red China.

May we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair trusts that the Senate will be in order, so that we may proceed with the business of the Senate.

Mr. MALONE. Now, Mr. President, the non-Communist nations which have recognized Red China are the United Kingdom, Norway, Denmark, Israel, Afghanistan, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Indonesia, Burma, India, and Pakistan.

The Communist nations which have recognized Red China are the U. S. S. R., Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, North Korea, Yugoslavia, Outer Mongolia, Hungary, and Albania.

FOREIGN AID TO FRIENDS OF RED CHINA INDIRECTLY AIDS AMERICA'S ENEMIES

Nations that recognize Red China are giving aid, comfort, strength, and prestige to our enemies.

When the United States gives direct aid to any of these Communist-loving nations it is, in fact, giving indirect aid to Red China itself.

For example, we gave Great Britain billions. Britain poured some of this wealth into her jet-engine industry. The industry sold jet engines to Russia. Russia gave jet planes to Red China. And the jets our dollars bought shot down Americans. That actually happened, as the junior Senator from Nevada previously reported on the Senate floor.

RED CHINA MURDER VICTIMS INCLUDE AMERICAN CHILDREN

So our aid comes back in wooden coffins with an American flag draped over them.

Mr. President, only a few days ago Red Chinese airmen murdered three American citizens riding in a British plane over the high seas off the coast of Asia.

There is reason to believe that the Communist gunmen thought that this plane was carrying a distinguished American ambassador, but in that they were mistaken.

Whatever their motive, they shot down the unarmed British aircraft, killing several Britons in addition to an American adult and two American children, one 4 and the other 2 years old.

The Communist gunmen then attacked American rescue missions, but without success.

Britain made very little fuss about it, although they did make some representations to the Red Chinese, representations which the junior Senator from Nevada considered rather mild.

They also conveyed our strong protest to Red Chinese officials, which drew Communist sneers—not at Britain but at the United States.

FOREIGN-AID DOLLARS HELP BRITAIN BUILD BIG BUSINESS WITH COMMUNISTS

Britain is in business with Red China—big business—and wants to avoid any semblance of a family tiff, even though the tiff involves killing British subjects in addition to killing Americans.

Other nations fattened on American tax dollars are in business with Red China.

American-aid dollars have helped put these nations in shape to be in business with Red China.

More American dollars to these nations as proposed in the pending foreign aid bill will put them in better shape to do business with Red China.

Perhaps these dollars will enable them to do so much business with Red China that Red China will feel able to carry on further aggressions, and will be better equipped to murder American citizens on the high seas.

Mr. President, I would not want to give a gun to an enemy who planned to shoot me, nor would I choose to give a gun to an acquaintance who, I knew, would promptly turn the gun over to an enemy.

FOREIGN NATIONS BACK RED CHINA'S U. N. BID AFTER FATTENING ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID

Since World War II Great Britain has received \$6,838,000,000 in foreign-aid grants and credits from the United States, and approximately \$1 billion more has been laid aside for her out of previous appropriations which she has not had time yet to collect.

Britain recognizes Red China and is possibly the most aggressive sponsor of Red China's application for membership in the big Manhattan club called the United Nations.

India not only recognizes Red China but has become her big Asiatic playmate. India has received slightly more than a quarter billion dollars in postwar foreign grants and credits from the United States.

Pakistan is into us for \$100 million in foreign aid and expects more. She recognizes Red China.

Tiny Denmark has received \$283 million in foreign aid, but she was quick to recognize the Communist Government of Red China, despite this largess from the American taxpayers.

Norway hopped on the Red Chinese recognition bandwagon, although we helped put Norway back on her feet after the war and have given her \$306 million in foreign-aid grants and credits contributed by our hard-pressed taxpayers.

Sweden recognizes Red China, but Sweden recognizes and does business with everybody, and we have given Sweden only \$106 million in foreign aid.

The Netherlands have received 1,077,000,000 foreign aid dollars. Like Britain, she also recognizes Red China.

So does Indonesia, the Netherlands' former southeast Asia colony, to which we have given 216 million foreign aid dollars.

These dollars exclude grants in military aid, which are not broken down by country. Military aid for Western Europe as of March 31 totaled \$8,411,000,000; for Asia and the Pacific, \$2,468,000,000.

NATIONS WHICH DO NOT RECOGNIZE RED CHINA GET SHORT END OF FOREIGN AID ALLOCATIONS

The American Republics, which have not recognized Red China, have received only \$169 million in military grants, so

apparently a foreign nation that wants to dig deep into the United States Treasury would recognize Red China.

This amendment would end indirect American aid to Red China by ending direct aid to foreign nations that have established diplomatic and friendly relations with our Communist enemies.

It would not affect foreign aid to nations which, like ourselves, refuse to deal with Red murderers and aggressors.

Those who are dedicated to giving away America's wealth to foreign governments would still have ample countries into which American dollars could be poured.

CUTOFF OF AID TO RED CHINA'S FRIENDS WOULD PERMIT MORE AID TO OUR TRUE ALLIES

We could still aid those nations that are not aiding Red China.

As a matter of fact, limiting our foreign aid—assuming that this administration-Dulles-Stassen backed bill will ultimately pass—to nations who do not give aid and comfort to our enemies would increase the aid America's true friends receive and in effect reward them for not rushing to Red China's slimy embrace.

Nations receiving foreign aid which have not teamed up with Red China include France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Philippines.

"FREE WORLD" A MISNOMER WHEN APPLIED TO NATIONS RECOGNIZING RED CHINA

That is about the extent of the "free world" today.

Mr. President, the expression "free world" has been used very loosely in recent years by our foreign trade and aid advocates.

It has been used to include the United Kingdom and other nations that by their own actions are not entitled to be considered part of the free world.

BRITAIN'S DOUBLED DEALING INCLUDES SECURITY PACT WITH RUSSIA

Mr. President, on Friday the junior Senator from Nevada read into the RECORD part of a mutual security pact that England has with Russia and that France has with Russia, mutual security pacts entirely independent of the pact that they have with us, with paragraphs reading almost exactly the same. In other words, they are signed up with both teams. Like the Giants and the Yankees, whichever one wins, they are in the money.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Without naming all the countries, I gather that the Senator is advocating cutting off all trade with them.

Mr. MALONE. Why not? Yes, that is correct. Cut off all grants of aid and assistance.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. And all trade with Great Britain?

RED CHINA'S CHIEF U. N. SPONSOR—BRITAIN

Mr. MALONE. That is right, cut off all monetary and other grants as long as she recognizes Red China and is the chief sponsor of Red China in the United Nations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I just wanted to get the purpose of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MALONE. You have it. Cut off all grants of aid as long as they are in effect arming our potential enemy.

These nations have tied themselves with Red China and, therefore, do not have diplomatic freedom to participate in free world efforts for peace and security.

They have linked themselves with Soviet Russia and all of Soviet Russia's satellites in recognition of Red China, a branded aggressor, enslaver, and murderer.

NATIONS RECOGNIZING RED CHINA LISTED

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks I may place in the RECORD a list of the governments which have recognized Red China's Communist regime.

I shall divide it into two groups, one comprising those nations which have formally espoused communism, and the other consisting of those which are friendly with it, or are flirting with it economically and diplomatically.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENTS RECOGNIZING RED CHINA

Communist: U. S. S. R., Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, North Korea, Yugoslavia, Outer Mongolia, Hungary, Albania.

Non-Communist: United Kingdom, Norway, Denmark, Israel, Afghanistan, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, Netherlands, Indonesia, Burma, India, Pakistan.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, my amendment, if adopted, would cut off foreign aid to the nations listed directly above.

There is not one iota of benefit a continuance of that aid can buy us.

It cannot buy us strength if the effort to resist Red China's expansion because these countries are in cahoots with the Red Chinese.

All that any expenditure of further foreign aid funds in these countries can buy is further troubles, further public debt, further humiliations, further air murders over the high seas, and increased probability of a fourth world war.

FOURTH WORLD WAR MAY FIND MOST AIDED NATIONS ON SIDELINES

Whether it is called a fourth world war or a third world war depends on whether the war in Korea was a third world war. One hundred and fifty thousand American boys took part in that war. If it is not considered a world war, it will do until one comes along.

Such a war, Mr. President, I fear would find us without the support of those countries which have been the greatest beneficiaries of our billions in foreign aid.

They have been among the first to "buddy up" with our enemies, the Communists.

England has virtually crawled in bed with them.

Mr. President, last year Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer R. A. Butler invented a cunning slogan. The slogan was "Trade, not aid."

ONE-WORLDEERS RALLY TO BRITISH SLOGANS

Most of those slogans are invented by the beneficiaries of our aid. "Dollar shortage" was a slogan which came out of London. Dollar shortage is the fixing of the price of our dollars so that nobody but a silly Congress will buy them at higher than the market price. It was promptly seized upon by all our one-worlders and professional do-gooders at taxpayers' expense to promote more British trade with Communists, Communist Russia, Communist satellites, Communists everywhere.

BRITAIN ENTHUSIASTIC OVER RED TRADE PROSPECTS

Britain is getting her trade with the Communists and expects more. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a press dispatch from London which was published in the July 27, 1954, issue of the New York Journal of Commerce under the head "United Kingdom Sees Big Rise in Sales to Soviet Bloc," and "August 16 Cut in Controls to Free Many Goods, Trade Official States."

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED KINGDOM SEES BIG RISE IN SALES TO SOVIET BLOC—AUGUST 16 CUT IN CONTROLS TO FREE MANY GOODS, TRADE OFFICIAL STATES

LONDON, July 26.—Britain's trade boss, Peter Thorneycroft, today predicted "a substantial increase" in trade with the Soviet bloc as a result of slashing cuts now made in strategic controls on such trade.

The cuts, agreed between Britain, the United States and other interested non-Communist nations, do not affect continuing controls on trade with Red China.

SEES SECURITY INTACT

Mr. Thorneycroft told the House of Commons the increased trade would not be at the expense of national security. He said talks still continued about controls on the export of ships. He declined to give details about goods which could now be exported more freely, but "some machine tools were included."

British and Iron Curtain country negotiators have been active for months trying to settle multimillion trade deals. Pending agreement on relaxed controls, many of these negotiations resulted only in paper agreements.

In his statement to Parliament, Mr. Thorneycroft said:

"We have reached unanimous agreement on a considerable reduction on the control lists."

EFFECTIVE AUGUST 16

"We have agreed that as from August 16 the present embargo list will be reduced by one-third from about 250 to 170 items, and the quantitative control list will be drastically cut from 90 to 20 items.

"A further 60 items will be kept on a watch list so that we can follow the trend of these exports.

"The overall result will be a substantial increase in the area of permitted trade which will at the same time be fully compatible with the needs of national security."

Mr. Thorneycroft said it had been agreed that those countries which had until now allowed goods to go freely to the Soviet bloc would now introduce controls in line with the transshipment controls Britain has operated since 1951.

A board of trade official said tonight Soviet bloc orders worth 20 million pounds (\$56 million) had been held up in Britain pending the decision on relaxed controls.

Of this total, 5 million pounds (\$14 million) worth would now be cleared for export. The remaining 15 million pounds (\$42 million) worth come under quantitative restrictions, and no quotas have yet been set.

UNEMPLOYMENT LINES IN UNITED STATES GROW AS AID POURED OUT TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Mr. MALONE. I also note an A. P. dispatch of July 11, headed "Shutdowns Boost Jobless Claims":

SHUTDOWNS BOOST JOBLESS CLAIMS

WASHINGTON, July 11.—The Labor Department reported over the weekend initial worker claims for State unemployment compensation payments rose by 50,000 to 315,000 during the week ended July 3.

The Department's Bureau of Employment said the increase was expected as plants closed down for vacation periods and workers not eligible for vacation pay filed unemployment claims.

Half the increase, or 25,000, came in three States, New York, Michigan, and New Jersey. The increase for the corresponding week a year ago was 73,000.

The volume of State-insured unemployment dropped by 40,200 to 1,873,000 during the week ended June 26, the third successive weekly decrease. Since mid-April, the number of persons drawing benefits has declined by 227,800. The total a year ago was 807,347.

The Bureau said the decline in number of workers drawing benefits was due partly to improved employment conditions in construction and other outdoor activities and scattered industries, and partly because additional workers were exhausting their entitlement to benefits.

Mr. President, we take Mr. Butler's slogan at its face value—trade, not aid. Britain is trading with the millions of dollars which are being provided by Mr. Stassen and his crew in the Foreign Operations Administration, and also has her hands out for more American aid dollars.

DOLLARS FROM UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS FATTEN BRITAIN'S AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

Mr. President, the Columbia Broadcasting System Monday night carried a news report from Seattle, Wash., headquarters of the Boeing Aircraft Co.

The broadcast reported the concern of that city over the fact that foreign aid funds are financing Britain's jet transport program in Britain's drive to beat America's aircraft industry to the gun in the jet air commerce race.

Boeing Aircraft Co., it was reported, has had to spend some \$15 million of its own money in design and construction of its new commercial jet.

Britain, on the other hand, spends money contributed by the American taxpayers through foreign aid, to build its jets, the jets it expects to rule the skies in world trade, much of it with the Communists.

The junior Senator from Nevada stood on the floor of the Senate in 1948, when there was under discussion the first giveaway program, the first world WPA to hit the Senate. That was the big one. That was the Marshall plan.

EXPOSURE OF BRITAIN'S JET ENGINE SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA RECALLED

The junior Senator from Nevada said on the floor of the Senate that Great Britain already had sent jet engines to Russia. Great Britain had done just that. It was denied by the War Department at first, but later was admitted.

That was where the jet engines for Russian MIG's came from. No one denies it now.

Mr. President, we have been and are financing Britain's intended dominance over our own aircraft industry, and are subsidizing Britain's aircraft builders, while our own industry must rely on money from its private stockholders.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that Great Britain is building a great many airplanes, and the aid which is being used is coming through Mr. Stassen and his mutual-security program? Are not the planes being built with British labor at the expense of the American taxpayers?

UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS PAYING FOR BRITAIN'S AIR EXPANSION

Mr. MALONE. That is absolutely true. Of course, the business of Mr. Stassen is

the giving away of money, so he would not understand the significance of the situation.

The bill now under consideration proposes an additional \$70 million in foreign aid to British airplane builders. Supposedly this money would go to construct military aircraft by British workers in British factories.

Whether these funds go into commercial aircraft or not, there will be profits to the British aircraft industry, and Britain can put those profits into its race to rule the skies, as Britain once ruled the seas.

I want it distinctly understood, Mr. President, that I do not blame Great Britain for anything she is doing with American dollars. I blame the Congress of the United States, composed of Senators and Representatives from every precinct in the Nation. We know where this money is going. If we do not, it is time different arrangements were made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD contracts awarded to the United Kingdom for aircraft and equipment during the fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

CONTRACTS GIVEN BRITAIN FOR AIRCRAFT AND EQUIPMENT LISTED

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will not the Senator give us the total amounts of those contracts?

Mr. MALONE. The totals of the contracts which I am now placing in the RECORD equal \$154 million excluding 1954 contracts of more than \$80 million for new made-in-Britain planes alone. That brings a total of over \$237,200,000 United States taxpayers are pouring into British aircraft factories.

There being no objection, the contracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Air Force, fiscal year 1952

ENGLAND

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AIRCRAFT AND EQUIPMENT				
AF 61 (514)-31	Sterling Cable Co., Ltd.	Berkshire, Aldermaston	Polychloroprene cable	\$12,075.00
AF 61 (514)-33	Rolls Royce, Ltd.	Derby	Engine cylinder heads	115,010.00
AF 61 (514)-63	R. F. D. Co., Ltd.	Godalming, Surrey	Tow targets	683,215.30
AF 61 (514)-64	Sangam C. Weston, Ltd.	Middlesex, Enfield	Portable ammeter	621.60
AF 61 (514)-67	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	Wolverhampton	Aircraft casings and tubes	248,468.84
AF 61 (514)-72	Dunlop Rubber Co., Ltd., Aviation	Coventry	do.	193,030.88
AF 61 (514)-79	British Vacuum Cleaner & Engineering Co.	Leatherhead, Surrey	Vacuum cleaners	3,819.78
AF 61 (514)-85	Kodak, Ltd.	London	Film readers	11,087.56
AF 61 (514)-95	Hilmor, Ltd.	do.	Tube benders	12,393.08
AF 61 (514)-165	Air Trainers, Ltd.	Aylesbury	Link trainer and spares	819,961.00
AF 61 (514)-187	Rolls Royce, Ltd.	Derby	V-1650 engine spares	1,112,999.70
AF 61 (514)-200	Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co., Ltd.	London	Oscillators	54,843.75
AF 61 (514)-214	General Electric Co.	do.	Radio receiving equipment	647,207.50
AF 61 (514)-220	Dunlop Rubber Co., Ltd., aviation	do.	Anti-G suits	351,072.00
AF 61 (514)-225	General Electric Co., Ltd.	do.	Rectifiers	63,251.31
AF 61 (514)-246	Casella & Co., Ltd.	do.	Monometers	7,822.50
Total				4,336,919.80
ELECTRONICS				
AF 61 (514)-228	Thorn Electrical Industries	London	AN/ARC-3, radio parts	2,409,381.98
ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT				
AF 61 (514)-232	Birtley Co., Ltd.	Birtley	Road scrapers	852,281.50
Total, England				7,598,583.28

U. S. Air Force, fiscal year 1953

UNITED KINGDOM

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AIRCRAFT AND EQUIPMENT				
AF 61 (514)-217	Sangamo Weston, Ltd.	Enfield/Middlesex	Portable ammeter	\$164.70
AF 61 (514)-330	Dunlop Rubber Co., Ltd.	Coventry	Tube, aircraft, inner, high pressure	14,368.86
AF 61 (514)-332	Her Majesty's Government	London	Hawker Hunter airplanes	140,074,200.00
AF 61 (514)-339	Fields Aircraft Services	Surrey	Removal aircraft from storage and preparation for flight	210,102.90
AF 61 (514)-365	Her Majesty's Government	London	Westland Dragonfly HC Mark IV helicopters (less engine)	936,800.00
AF 61 (514)-446	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. (Great Britain), Ltd.	Wolverhampton	Wheel assembly, nose, low profile	7,962.90
AF 61 (514)-451	Dunlop Rubber Co.	Coventry	Aero wheel and brake assembly	396,279.12
AF 61 (514)-452	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. (Great Britain), Ltd.	Wolverhampton	Wheel assembly, nose, extra high pressure	11,661.84
AF 61 (514)-495	G. H. Burgess & Co., Ltd.	Middlesex	Aerial banner tow targets and spares	327,704.79
AF 61 (514)-501	Avery-Hardell, Ltd.	Surbiton, Surrey	Aircraft fuel-servicing pressure-type nozzles	80,542.00
AF 61 (514)-564	North British Rubber Co., Ltd., Castle Mills	Edinburgh 39, Scotland	Aircraft casings	55,861.72
AF 61 (514)-566	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Ltd.	Wolverhampton	do.	396,441.29
AF 61 (514)-576	Thorn Electrical Industries, Ltd.	London, W. C. 1	Reverse current cutout	39,805.89
AF 61 (514)-584	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. (Great Britain), Ltd.	Wolverhampton	Wheel and brake assembly	1,930,267.16
AF 61 (514)-594	Kelvin & Hughes, Ltd.	London, S. W. 1	Machmeters, altimeters, and spare parts	235,084.35
Total				144,717,247.52

U. S. Air Force, fiscal year 1953—Continued

UNITED KINGDOM—Continued

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
ELECTRONICS				
AF 61 (514)-214	General Electric Co., Ltd.	London, W. C. 2	Radio receiving equipment	\$748,287.00
AF 61 (514)-228	Thorn Electrical Industries, Ltd.	London, W. C. 1	Radio receiver, R-77A/ARC-3; radio transmitter, T-67/ARC-3.	1,117,486.78
AF 61 (514)-562	do	Middlesex	Engineering radio sets	118,864.12
Total				1,984,636.90
ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT				
AF 61 (514)-304	T. S. Harrison & Sons, Ltd.	Yorks.	Lathe, bench type, geared	13,027.57
MISCELLANEOUS				
AF 61(514)-416	Her Majesty's Government	London	Inspection (aeronautical)	150,000.00
Total United Kingdom				146,864,911.99

BRITISH AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY GAINS HALF BILLION FROM UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS

Mr. MALONE. Offshore aircraft procurement contracts for the fiscal year 1954 went entirely to the United Kingdom. The total amount is \$80,770,000.

Unfortunately, I do not have a breakdown of aircraft equipment procurement in Great Britain during 1954.

I do have, however, a listing of all offshore procurement in the United King-

dom for fiscal 1952 and fiscal 1953 other than those placed by the United States Air Force, which are given above.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a listing of United States Army and United States Navy offshore procurement contracts placed with the United Kingdom during those 2 fiscal years which with the Air Force con-

tracts, total more than \$450 million. Add the \$80 million that we know about in 1954, this makes more than a half billion dollars shipped over to Britain's aircraft industry at the expense of United States taxpayers and the American aircraft industry.

There being no objection, the list of the contracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Navy, fiscal year 1952

UNITED KINGDOM

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AMMUNITION				
N625588-47	Admiralty	London	Ammunition	\$110,000.00
N625588-65	do	do	do	664,000.00
N625588-66	do	do	Torpedoes	488,400.00
N625588-134	do	do	Ammunition	29,350.00
N625588-135	do	do	Grenades, cartridges, projectiles	12,000.00
N625588-136	Vickers Armstrong	do	Projectiles and cartridges	10,000.00
N625588-137	Admiralty	London	Projectiles, ammunition	22,500.00
N625588-138	Vickers Armstrong	do	Cartridges	117,000.00
UK-8-151	Admiralty	London	Semi-armor-piercing ammunition	60,842.00
				1,514,092.00
ARTILLERY				
N625588-64	do	do	40 millimeter guns	350,000.00
ELECTRONICS				
N625588-41	Decca Radar, Ltd.		Radar sets	121,389.00
N625588-52	do		do	77,940.00
N625588-72	do		do	35,154.00
N625588-73	do		do	97,900.00
N625588-74	do		do	14,761.00
N625588-75	do		do	204,254.00
N625588-72	Murphy Radio		Receivers	132,766.00
N625588-103	McMichael Radio		do	1,189,000.00
N625588-116	Bush Radio		do	61,300.00
N625588-118	Pye, Ltd.		Trans/receiver	225,000.00
N625588-147	Decca Radar Ltd.		Radar sets	58,249.00
NOBFR-59498	do		Solenoid sets	3,848,000.00
Total				6,055,713.00
SHIPS AND EQUIPMENT				
N625588-22 (P)	Admiralty	London	Inlet valves, cylinder heads, blocks	1,500.00
N625588-23 (P)	do	do	Connecting rods, crankshafts	1,850.00
N625588-29 (P)	do	do	High-pressure air bottles	3,200.00
N625588-30 (P)	do	do	Testmeters, regulators, etc.	1,210.00
N625588-31 (P)	do	do	Inversion units	1,115.00
N625588-32 (P)	do	do	Generators	4,660.00
N625588-36 (P)	Lincoln Electric, Ltd.	do	Welders, starters	1,625.00
N625588-49	Marconi Wireless Co.	do	Calibrators	1,935.00
N625588-63	A. Hirst & Sons	do	Forklift trucks	15,747.00
N625588-63	Admiralty	London	Minesweeping gear, cutters	26,000.00
N625588-66	do	do	Smoke candles	6,250.00
N625588-68	do	do	Base spares PPI	7,500.00
N625588-100 (P)	do	do	Base spares, ship spares	1,600.00
N625588-108	Wm. Denny Bros.	do	Spares	5,000.00
N625588-121	Crossley	do	Diesel spares	8,335.00
N625588-126	Norris Henty & Gardner	do	do	13,387.00
N625588-127	Admiralty	London	Mounts, generators, and diesel-engine oscillator, sweep	68,800.00
N625588-129	B. Elliott	do	Milling machine, milling attachments, etc.	5,987.00
N625588-132	Admiralty	London	Base spares, ship spares	7,000.00
N625588-133	do	do	Base spares	15,000.00
N625588-140	Fairfield Shipbuilding	do	Diesel-engine spares	16,000.00

U. S. Navy, fiscal year 1952—Continued

UNITED KINGDOM—Continued

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
SHIPS AND EQUIPMENT—Continued				
N62558S-141	Admiralty	London	Cable	\$38,500.00
N62558S-150	British Polar Engines		Diesel spares	8,000.00
N62558S-151(P)	Admiralty	London	Fire bricks	1,670.00
N62558S-154	British Emulsifiers		Cutters, stop wedges	92,668.00
N62558S-155(P)	Admiralty	London	Assembling machine, gages	4,100.00
UK-8-51	do	do	Drill mines	14,720.00
Total				373,359.00
ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT				
N62558S-97	David Brown Tractors		Diesel tractors	85,120.00
N62558S-104	Conveyancer Fork Trucks		Fork trucks	5,895.00
N62558S-105	do		do	9,779.00
N62558S-107	Conveyancer Fork Trucks, Ltd.		Fork trucks, spare parts	242,202.00
				342,996.00
WEAPONS AND SMALL ARMS				
N62558S-58	Admiralty	London	Oerlikon mounting	7,800.00
MISCELLANEOUS				
N62558S-113	Creed & Co.		Teleprinter	18,568.00
Informal purchase orders from United Kingdom				14,579.70
Total				33,147.70
Total United Kingdom				8,677,107.70

U. S. Navy, fiscal year 1953

UNITED KINGDOM

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AMMUNITION AND EXPLOSIVES				
N62558S-66	Admiralty	London	Torpedoes "21"	\$41,600.00
N62558S-134	do	do	Ammunition, 4.7-inch	29,346.80
N62558S-284	do	do	do	20,109.90
N62558S-285	do	do	do	16,474.50
N62558S-291	do	do	Smoke candles and grenades	21,606.00
N62558S-340	do	do	Depth charges	78,424.00
N62558S-341	do	do	Ammunition	28,847.00
N62558S-366	Ministry of Supply	do	do	268,223.00
N62558S-367	Admiralty	do	Starshell ammunition	12,778.00
Total				517,409.20
AIRCRAFT				
N62558S-211	Ministry of Supply	London	Aircraft	12,810,040.00
ARTILLERY				
N62558S-301	Admiralty	London	40-millimeter guns w/spares	135,613.00
ELECTRONICS				
N62558S-102	Murphy Radio, Ltd.	Hertfordshire	Sonobuoy receivers	96,631.07
N62558S-118	Pye, Ltd. (addition to 1952 contract)	London	Transmitters and receivers	53,282.34
N62558S-200	Decca Radar, Ltd.	do	Radar remote PPI	33,824.00
N62558S-201	do	do	Navigational radar	138,718.00
N62558S-204	do	do	Radar remote PPI	13,836.00
N62558S-205	do	do	Decca marine and radar units	108,924.20
N62558S-212	Michael Radio, Ltd.	Slough	Sonobuoy transmitters	459,893.28
N62558S-213	Decca Navigator Co.	London	Decca M K 5 marine receivers	285,432.00
N62558S-300	Marconi Wireless Telegraph		Electronics test set	32,423.69
N62558S-334	Cinema Telephone, Ltd.		Electronics equipment	7,560.00
N62558S-345	Marconi Wireless Telegraph		do	6,934.13
N62558S-345	Recall Engineering, Ltd.		Electric receivers	227,997.00
N62558S-347	Admiralty	London	Radio receiving equipment	6,919.00
N62558S-366	do	do	Radio direction finders	10,998.00
N62558S-381	Swiss Radio Busch	do	Receivers	12,699.00
Nobs-59595	Hazeltine Electric Corp.		Radar	6,756,000.00
Total				8,252,071.71
ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT				
N62558S-346	Lansing Bagnall, Ltd.		Gasoline power tractor	734.86
SHIPS EQUIPMENT				
N62558S-121	Crossley Bros., Ltd.	Manchester	Spares for Crossley engines	29,607.53
N62558S-150	British Polar Engines, Ltd.	Glasgow	Spares for British Polar engines	26,965.60
N62558S-179	Secretary of the Admiralty	London	Submarine battery	130,000.00
N62558S-180	do	do	Apparatus for checking torpedo tails	10,000.00
N62558S-190	do	do	Fire-control system	154,000.00
N62558S-198	Norris, Henty & Gardners	Lancashire	Spares for British Gardner engines	13,636.11
N62558S-296	Perkins	Peterboro	Diesel engines	30,112.00
N62558S-299			Submarine batteries	126,765.00
N62558S-310			Squid projectors	167,329.00
N62558S-331			Squids	194,926.00

U. S. Navy, fiscal year 1953—Continued

UNITED KINGDOM—Continued

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
SHIPS EQUIPMENT—continued				
N625588-332	Admiralty	London	Astic equipment	\$214,182.00
N625588-335	do	do	Minesweeping equipment	47,554.00
N625588-344	do	do	Plotting table	83,614.00
N625588-362(LI)	do	do	Minesweeping equipment	239,700.00
N625588-377	do	do	Wire sweeps	157,920.00
Total				1,626,311.24
SHIPS (BUSHIPS)				
Nobs-4032	Secretary of the Admiralty	London	Inshore minesweepers	11,676,000.00
MISCELLANEOUS				
N-625588-302	Admiralty	do	Inspection services	4,225.50
Total, United Kingdom.				35,022,405.51

U. S. Army, fiscal year 1953

UNITED KINGDOM

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AMMUNITION AND EXPLOSIVES				
DA-91-557-EUC-75	Her Majesty's Government	London	Shell, 20 pdr smoke; 20 pdr blank; 7.92-millimeter; hand grenade	\$18,161,104.83
DA-91-557-EUC-114	do	do	Shell, H.E. M107, 155-millimeter	20,675,187.00
DA-91-557-EUC-130	do	do	Shell, 90-millimeter	29,021,250.00
DA-91-557-EUC-140	Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.	Birmingham	Cartridge, Caliber .50	1,799,513.36
DA-91-557-EUC-147	Her Majesty's Government	London	Shell, 90-millimeter smoke; shell, 155-millimeter smoke	11,859,246.80
DA-91-557-EUC-178	Ministry of Supply	do	Shot, 90-millimeter, T&A T gun	12,221,000.00
DA-91-557-EUC-181	Her Majesty's Government	do	Rocket, HEAT, 3.5-inch	6,320,000.00
DA-91-557-EUC-182	do	do	Shell, 105-millimeter	1,372,500.00
Total				101,429,802.04
ELECTRONICS				
DA-91-557-EUC-88	Thorn Elec. Industries, Ltd.	London	Radio set AN/GRR-5 and spares	1,438,650.00
DA-91-557-EUC-122	The British Thomson-Houston Co., Ltd.	Rugby	Radar, British No. 3 MK 7 and spares	4,177,488.00
DA-91-557-EUC-165	R. A. Lister & Co., Ltd.	Gloucester	do	794,358.88
DA-91-557-EUC-168	British Ministry of Supply	London	Predictor AA No. 11A, Mk3	6,880,020.00
Total				13,290,516.88
WEAPONS AND SMALL ARMS				
DA-91-557-EUC-75	Her Majesty's Government	London	Spare parts for B. E. S. A. machinegun	5,699.52
DA-91-557-EUC-160	do	do	Armament spares	900,000.00
Total				906,699.52
COMBAT VEHICLES				
DA-91-557-EUC-75	Her Majesty's Government	London	{Centurion tanks	80,029,663.74
DA-91-557-EUC-75	do	do	{Petrol trailers	
Total			Spare parts for Centurion tanks	2,533,505.39
				82,563,169.13
TRANSPORT VEHICLES				
DA-91-557-EUC-145	J. A. Phillips & Co., Ltd.	Birmingham	Bicycle, men's military	37,424.14
MISCELLANEOUS				
DA-91-557-EUC-149	Her Majesty's Government	London	Inspection of ammunition	15,000.00
DA-91-557-EUC-254	do	do	Greek aid, signal items	480,675.75
DA-91-557-EUC-203			Greek aid, ordnance and medical items	600,479.54
Total				1,096,155.29
Total, United Kingdom.				199,323,767.00

U. S. Air Force, fiscal year 1953

UNITED KINGDOM

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AIRCRAFT AND EQUIPMENT				
AF 61 (514)-217	Sangamo Weston, Ltd.	Enfield/Middlesex	Portable ammeter	\$164.70
AF 61 (514)-330	Dunlop Rubber Co., Ltd.	Coventry	Tube, aircraft, inner high pressure	14,368.86
AF 61 (514)-332	Her Majesty's Government	London	Hawker Hunter airplanes	140,074,200.00
AF 61 (514)-339	Fields Aircraft Services	Surrey	Removal aircraft from storage and preparation for flight	210,102.90
AF 61 (514)-365	Her Majesty's Government	London	Westland Dragonfly HC, Mark IV helicopters (less engine)	936,800.00

U. S. Air Force, fiscal year 1953—Continued

UNITED KINGDOM—Continued

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AIRCRAFT AND EQUIPMENT—continued				
AF 61 (514)-446	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. (Great Britain), Ltd.	Wolverhampton	Wheel assembly, nose, low profile	\$7,962.90
AF 61 (514)-451	Dunlop Rubber Co.	Coventry	Aerno wheel and brake assembly	396,279.12
AF 61 (514)-452	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. (Great Britain), Ltd.	Wolverhampton	Wheel assembly, nose, extra high pressure	11,661.84
AF 61 (514)-495	G. H. Burgess & Co., Ltd.	Middlesex	Aerial banner tow targets and spares	327,704.79
AF 61 (514)-501	Avery-Handoll, Ltd.	Surbiton, Surrey	Aircraft fuel servicing, pressure-type nozzles	80,542.00
AF 61 (514)-564	North British Rubber Co., Ltd., Castle Mills	Edinburgh 39, Scotland	Aircraft casings	55,861.72
AF 61 (514)-566	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Ltd.	Wolverhampton	do	396,441.29
AF 61 (514)-576	Thorn Electrical Industries, Ltd.	London, W. C. 1	Reverse current cutout	39,805.89
AF 61 (514)-584	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. (Great Britain), Ltd.	Wolverhampton	Wheel and brake assembly	1,930,267.16
AF 61 (514)-594	Kelvin & Hughes, Ltd.	London, S. W. 1	Machmeters, altimeters and spare parts	235,084.35
Total				144,717,247.52
ELECTRONICS				
AF 61 (514)-214	General Electric Co., Ltd.	London, W. C. 2	Radio receiving equipment	748,287.00
AF 61 (514)-228	Thorn Electrical Industries, Ltd.	London, W. C. 1	Radio receiver, R-77A/ARC-3; radio transmitter, T-67/ARC-3	1,117,485.78
AF 61 (514)-562	do	Middlesex	Engineering radio sets	118,864.12
Total				1,984,636.90
ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT				
AF 61 (514)-304	T. S. Harrison & Sons, Ltd.	Yorks	Lathe, bench-type, geared	13,027.57
MISCELLANEOUS				
AF 61 (514)-416	Her Majesty's Government	London	Inspection (aeronautical)	150,000.00
Total, United Kingdom				146,864,911.99

OFFSHORE PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS PLACED BY UNITED STATES

U. S. Army, fiscal year 1952

UNITED KINGDOM

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AMMUNITION				
DA-91-557-EUC-17	Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.	Birmingham	Cartridges, 30-caliber, in cartons	\$6,840,100.00
DA-91-557-EUC-59	Her Majesty's Government	London	Shell, 90-millimeter, HE E71	21,830,221.80
DA-91-557-EUC-60	do	do	Shell, 155-millimeter howitzer 1	8,252,731.49
DA-91-557-EUC-61	do	do	Rocket HEAT 35-inch	9,910,000.00
DA-91-557-EUC-65	do	do	Inspection of EUC 17 cartridge, 30-caliber	71,720.00
Total				46,904,773.29
ELECTRONICS				
DA-91-557-EUC-1	Murphy Radio, Ltd.	Welwyn Garden City, Hertfordshire	Radio, SCR 300	819,565.63
DA-91-557-EUC-3	do	do	Inspection of above	16,373.65
DA-91-557-EUC-8	British Thompson	Rugby	Radar mark 7 and generator	4,879,959.00
				5,715,898.28
MISCELLANEOUS				
DA-91-557-EUC-40	Oliver Typewriting	Croydon	Typewriters	1,820.32
DA-91-557-EUC-41	Olivetti	Glasgow	do	990.00
				2,810.32
Total, United Kingdom				52,623,481.89

U. S. Air Force, fiscal year 1952

ENGLAND

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AIRCRAFT AND EQUIPMENT				
AF 61 (514)-31	Sterling Cable Co., Ltd.	Berkshire, Aldermaston	Polychloroprene cable	\$12,075.00
AF 61 (514)-33	Rolls Royce, Ltd.	Derby	Engine cylinder heads	115,010.00
AF 61 (514)-63	R. F. D. Co., Ltd.	Godalming, Surrey	Tow targets	683,215.30
AF 61 (514)-64	Sangam C. Weston, Ltd.	Middlesex, Enfield	Portable ammeter	621.60
AF 61 (514)-67	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	Wolverhampton	Aircraft casings and tubes	248,498.84
AF 61 (514)-72	Dunlop Rubber Co., Ltd. Aviation	Coventry	do	193,030.88
AF 61 (514)-79	British Vacuum Cleaner & Engineering Co.	Leatherhead, Surrey	Vacuum cleaners	3,819.78
AF 61 (514)-85	Kodak, Ltd.	London	Film readers	11,097.56
AF 61 (514)-95	Hilmor, Ltd.	do	Tube benders	12,393.08
AF 61 (514)-165	Air Trainers, Ltd.	Aylesbury	Link trainer and spares	819,961.00
AF 61 (514)-187	Rolls Royce, Ltd.	Derby	V-1650 engine spares	1,112,999.70
AF 61 (514)-200	Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co., Ltd.	London	Oscillators	54,843.75

U. S. Air Force, fiscal year 1952—Continued

ENGLAND—Continued

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AIRCRAFT AND EQUIPMENT—continued				
AF 61(514)-214	General Electric Co.	London	Radio receiving equipment	\$647,207.50
AF 61(514)-220	Dunlop Rubber Co., Ltd., aviation	do	Anti-G suits	351,072.00
AF 61(514)-225	General Electric Co., Ltd.	do	Rectifiers	63,251.31
AF 61(514)-246	Casella & Co., Ltd.	do	Monometers	7,822.50
Total				4,336,919.80
ELECTRONICS				
AF 61(514)-228	Thorn Electrical Industries, Ltd.	London	AN/ARC-3, radio parts	2,409,381.98
ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT				
AF 61(514)-232	Birtley Co., Ltd.	Birtley	Road scrapers	852,281.50
Total England				7,598,583.28

U. S. Navy, fiscal year 1952

UNITED KINGDOM

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AMMUNITION				
N62558S-47	Admiralty	London	Ammunition	\$110,000.00
N62558S-65	do	do	do	664,000.00
N62558S-66	do	do	Torpedoes	488,400.00
N62558S-134	do	do	Ammunition	29,350.00
N62558S-135	do	do	Grenades, cartridges, projectiles	12,000.00
N62558S-136	Vickers Armstrong	do	Projectiles and cartridges	10,000.00
N62558S-137	Admiralty	London	Projectiles, ammunition	22,500.00
N62558S-138	Vickers Armstrong	do	Cartridges	117,000.00
UK-8-151	Admiralty	London	Semi-armor-piercing ammunition	60,842.00
Total				1,514,092.00
ARTILLERY				
N62558S-64	Admiralty	London	40 millimeter guns	350,000.00
ELECTRONICS				
N62558S-41	Decca Radar, Ltd.		Radar sets	121,389.00
N62558S-52	do	do	do	77,940.00
N62558S-72	do	do	do	\$35,154.00
N62558S-73	do	do	do	97,900.00
N62558S-74	do	do	do	14,761.00
N62558S-75	do	do	do	204,254.00
N62558S-102	Murphy Radio	do	Receivers	132,766.00
N62558S-103	McMichael Radio	do	do	1,189,000.00
N62558S-116	Bush Radio	do	do	51,300.00
N62558S-118	Pye, Ltd.	do	Transmitter/receiver	225,000.00
N62558S-147	Decca Radar, Ltd.	do	Radar sets	58,249.00
NOBFR-59498			Solenoid sets	3,848,000.00
				6,055,713.00
SHIPS AND EQUIPMENT				
N62558S-22 (P)	Admiralty	London	Inlet valves, cylinder heads, blocks	1,500.00
N62558S-23 (P)	do	do	Connecting rods, crankshafts	1,850.00
N62558S-29 (P)	do	do	High pressure air bottles	3,200.00
N62558S-30 (P)	do	do	Testmeters, regulators, etc.	1,210.00
N62558S-31 (P)	do	do	Inversion units	1,115.00
N62558S-32 (P)	do	do	Generators	4,660.00
N62558S-36 (P)	Lincoln Electric, Ltd.	do	Welders, starters	1,625.00
N62558S-49	Marconi Wireless Co.	do	Calibrators	1,935.00
N62558S-53	A. Hirst & Sons	do	Forklift trucks	15,747.00
N62558S-63	Admiralty	London	Minesweeping gear, cutters	26,000.00
N62558S-96	do	do	Smoke candles	6,250.00
N62558S-98	do	do	Base spares PPI	7,500.00
N62558S-100 (P)	do	do	Base spares, ship spares	1,600.00
N62558S-108	do	do	Spares	5,000.00
N62558S-121	Wm. Denny Bros.	do	Diesel spares	8,335.00
N62558S-126	Crossley	do	do	13,387.00
N62558S-127	Norris Henty & Gardner	do	Mounts, generators and diesel engine oscillator, sweep	68,800.00
N62558S-129	Admiralty	London	Milling machine, milling attachments, etc.	5,987.00
N62558S-132	B. Elliott	do	Base spares, ship spares	7,000.00
N62558S-133	Admiralty	do	Base spares	15,000.00
N62558S-140	Fairfield Shipbuilding	do	Diesel engine spares	16,000.00
N62558S-141	Admiralty	London	Cable	38,500.00
N62558S-150	British Polar Engines	do	Diesel spares	8,000.00
N62558S-151 (P)	Admiralty	London	Fire bricks	1,670.00
N62558S-154	British Emulsifiers	do	Cutters, stop wedges	92,668.00
N62558S-155 (P)	Admiralty	London	Assembling machine, gages	4,100.00
UK-8-51	do	do	Drill mines	14,720.00
				373,359.00
ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT				
N62558S-97	David Brown Tractors		Diesel tractors	85,120.00
N62558S-104	Conveyancer Fork Trucks		Fork trucks	5,895.00
N62558S-105	do	do	do	9,779.00
N62558S-107	Conveyancer Fork Trucks, Ltd.		Fork trucks, spare parts	242,202.00
				342,996.00

U. S. Navy, fiscal year 1952—Continued

UNITED KINGDOM—Continued

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
WEAPONS AND SMALL ARMS				
N62558S-58	Admiralty	London	Oerlikon mountings	\$7,800.00
MISCELLANEOUS				
N62558S-113	Creed & Co.		Teleprinter	18,568.00
Informal purchase orders from United Kingdom.				14,579.70
				33,147.70
Total United Kingdom.				8,677,107.70

U. S. Navy, fiscal year 1953

UNITED KINGDOM

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AMMUNITION AND EXPLOSIVES				
N62558S-66	Admiralty	London	Torpedoes "21"	\$41,600.00
N62558S-134	do	do	Ammunition, 4.7-inch	29,346.80
N62558S-284	do	do	do	20,109.90
N62558S-285	do	do	do	16,474.50
N62558S-291	do	do	Smoke candles and grenades	21,606.00
N62558S-340	do	do	Depth charges	78,424.00
N62558S-341	do	do	Ammunition	28,847.00
N62558S-366	Ministry of Supply	do	do	268,223.00
N62558S-367	Admiralty	do	Starshell ammunition	12,778.00
Total				517,409.20
AIRCRAFT				
N62558S-211	Ministry of Supply	London	Aircraft	12,810,040.00
ARTILLERY				
N62558S-301	Admiralty	do	40-millimeter guns w/spares	135,613.00
ELECTRONICS				
N62558S-102	Murphy Radio, Ltd.	Hertfordshire	Sonobuoy receivers	96,631.07
N62558S-118	Pye, Ltd. (addition to 1952 contract)	London	Transmitters and receivers	53,282.34
N62558S-200	do	do	Radar remote PPI	33,824.00
N62558S-201	Decca Radar, Ltd.	do	Navigational radar	138,718.00
N62558S-204	do	do	Radar remote PPI	13,836.00
N62558S-205	do	do	Decca marine and radar units	108,924.20
N62558S-212	Michael Radio, Ltd.	Slough	Sonobuoy transmitters	459,853.28
N62558S-213	Decca Navigator Co.	London	Decca M.K. 5 marine receivers	285,432.00
N62558S-300	Marconi Wireless Telegraph	do	Electronics test set	32,423.69
N62558S-334	Cinema Telephone, Ltd.	do	Electronics equipment	7,560.00
N62558S-336	Marconi Wireless Telegraph	do	do	6,934.13
N62558S-345	Recall Engineering, Ltd.	do	Electric receivers	227,997.00
N62558S-347	Admiralty	London	Radio receiving equipment	6,919.00
N62558S-366	do	do	Radio direction finders	10,998.00
N62558S-381	Swiss Radio Busch	do	Receivers	12,699.00
N62558S-39595	Hazeltine Electric Corp.	do	Radar	6,756,000.00
Total				8,252,071.71
ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT				
N62558S-346	Lansing Bagnall, Ltd.		Gasoline power tractor	734.86
SHIPS EQUIPMENT				
N62558S-121	Crossley Bros., Ltd.	Manchester	Spares for Crossley engines	29,607.53
N62558S-150	British Polar Engines, Ltd.	Glasgow	Spares for British Polar engines	26,965.60
N62558S-179	Secretary of the Admiralty	London	Submarine battery	130,000.00
N62558S-180	do	do	Apparatus for checking torpedo tails	10,000.00
N62558S-190	do	do	Fire-control system	154,000.00
N62558S-198	Norris, Henty & Gardner	Lancashire	Spares for British Gardner engines	13,636.11
N62558S-206	Perkins	Peterboro	Diesel engines	30,112.00
N62558S-299	do	do	Submarine batteries	126,705.00
N62558S-310	do	do	Squid projectors	167,329.00
N62558S-331	do	do	Squids	194,926.00
N62558S-332	Admiralty	London	Astic equipment	214,182.00
N62558S-335	do	do	Minesweeping equipment	47,554.00
N62558S-344	do	do	Plotting table	83,614.00
N62558S-362(LI)	do	do	Minesweeping equipment	239,700.00
N62558S-377	do	do	Wire sweeps	157,920.00
Total				1,626,311.24
SHIPS (BUSHIPS)				
N62558S-4032	Secretary of the Admiralty	London	Inshore minesweepers	11,676,000.00
MISCELLANEOUS				
N-62558S-302	Admiralty	do	Inspection services	4,225.50
Total, United Kingdom.				35,022,405.51

OFFSHORE PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS PLACED BY UNITED STATES

U. S. Army, fiscal year 1952

UNITED KINGDOM

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AMMUNITION				
DA-91-557-EUC-17	Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.	Birmingham	Cartridge, 30-caliber, in cartons	\$6,840,100.00
DA-91-557-EUC-59	Her Majesty's Government	London	Shell, 90-millimeter, EE E71	21,830,221.80
DA-91-557-EUC-60	do	do	Shell, 155-millimeter howitzer M1	8,252,731.49
DA-91-557-EUC-61	do	do	Rocket HEAT 85-inch	9,910,000.00
DA-91-557-EUC-65	do	do	Inspection of EUC 17	
			Cartridge, 30-caliber	71,720.00
Total				46,904,773.29
ELECTRONICS				
DA-91-557-EUC-1	Murphy Radio, Ltd.	Welwyn Garden City, Hertfordshire	Radio SCR-300	819,565.63
DA-91-557-EUC-3	do	do	Inspection of above	16,373.65
DA-91-557-EUC-8	British Thompson	Rugby	Radar mark 7 and generator	4,879,959.00
Total				5,715,898.28
MISCELLANEOUS				
DA-91-557-EUC-40	Oliver Typewriting	Croydon	Typewriters	1,820.32
DA-91-557-EUC-41	Olivetti	Glasgow	do	990.00
Total				2,810.32
Total, United Kingdom				52,623,481.89

U. S. Army fiscal year 1953

UNITED KINGDOM

Contract No.	Contractor	City	Item	Amount
AMMUNITION AND EXPLOSIVES				
DA-91-557-EUC-75	Her Majesty's Government	London	Shell, 20 pounder, smoke; 20 pounder, blank; 7.92 millimeter; hand grenade	\$18,161,104.88
DA-91-557-EUC-114	do	do	Shell, HE, M107, 155 millimeter	20,675,187.00
DA-91-557-EUC-130	do	do	Shell, 90 millimeter	29,021,250.00
DA-91-557-EUC-140	Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.	Birmingham	Cartridge, caliber .50	1,799,513.36
DA-91-557-EUC-147	Her Majesty's Government	London	Shell, 90 millimeter, smoke; shell, 155 millimeter, smoke	11,859,246.80
DA-91-557-EUC-178	Ministry of Supply	do	Shot, 90 millimeter, T & AT gun	12,221,000.00
DA-91-557-EUC-181	Her Majesty's Government	do	Rocket, HEAT, 3.5 inch	6,320,000.00
DA-91-557-EUC-182	do	do	Shell, 105 millimeter	1,372,500.00
Total				101,429,802.04
ELECTRONICS				
DA-91-557-EUC-88	Thorn Electrical Industries, Ltd.	London	Radio set, AN/GRR-5, and spares	1,438,650.00
DA-91-557-EUC-122	The British Thomson-Houston Co., Ltd.	Rugby	Radar, British No. 3, mark 7 and spares	4,177,488.00
DA-91-557-EUC-165	R. A. Lister & Co., Ltd.	Gloucester	do	794,358.88
DA-91-557-EUC-168	British Ministry of Supply	London	Predictor AA No. 11A, mark 3	6,880,020.00
Total				13,290,516.88
WEAPONS AND SMALL ARMS				
DA-91-557-EUC-75	Her Majesty's Government	London	Spare parts for B.E.S.A. machine gun	5,699.52
DA-91-557-EUC-75	do	do	Armament spares	900,000.00
Total				906,699.52
COMBAT VEHICLES				
DA-91-557-EUC-75	Her Majesty's Government	London	Centurion tanks, petrol trailers	80,029,663.74
DA-91-557-EUC-75	do	do	Spare parts for Centurion tanks	2,533,505.39
Total				82,563,169.13
TRANSPORT VEHICLES				
DA-91-557-EUC-145	J. A. Phillips & Co., Ltd.	Birmingham	Bicycle, men's military	37,424.14
MISCELLANEOUS				
DA-91-557-EUC-149	Her Majesty's Government	London	Inspection of ammunition	15,000.00
DA-91-557-EUC-254	do	do	Greek aid, signal items	480,675.75
DA-91-557-EUC-203	do	do	Greek aid, ordnance and medical items	600,479.54
Total				1,096,155.29
Total United Kingdom				199,323,767.00

WORLDWIDE UNITED STATES FOREIGN PROCUREMENT TOTAL EXCEEDS \$2,200,000,000

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the contracts listed above are only the contracts awarded to the United Kingdom. For Europe as a whole over \$2,200,000,000

in offshore procurement contracts were placed in the fiscal years 1952 and 1953. The fiscal year 1954 offshore procurement worldwide totals over \$900 million, of which about 90 percent is planned for Europe.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks the record of value of military assistance programs chargeable to appropriations, in millions of dollars, with the fiscal years headlined.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of Defense, MDAP as of Mar. 31, 1954—Europe

VALUE OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS CHARGEABLE TO APPROPRIATIONS

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1950-54	Fiscal year 1954	Proposed fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1950-55
Total.....	13,449.5	1,646.6	745.2	14,194.6
Materiel.....	12,327.6	1,227.6	430.9	12,758.4
Equipment and supplies.....	(12,007.3)	(1,217.6)	(420.9)	(12,428.1)
Other materiel charges.....	(320.3)	(10.0)	(10.0)	(330.3)
Training.....	265.2	84.9	46.2	311.4
Other (specify).....	416.5	129.0	120.4	536.9
Other P. C. H. & T.....	440.2	205.1	147.7	587.9
Other (regional and special projects).....				

VALUE OF PROGRAMS FOR EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1950-54 program				Fiscal year 1954 program		Proposed fiscal year 1955 program	
	Shipped		To be shipped		Chargeable to appropriation	Excess	Chargeable to appropriation	Excess
	Charged to appropriation	Excess	Chargeable to appropriation	Excess				
Total.....	5,752.9	478.8	6,254.4	21.5	1,217.6	3.8	420.9	
Army.....	4,122.3	152.2	2,404.6	3.6	431.6		126.3	
Navy.....	553.6	218.0	1,044.4	13.1	250.8	3.8	72.4	
Air Force.....	1,077.0	108.6	2,805.4	4.8	535.3		222.2	

TRAINING PROGRAMS—UNITED STATES AND OVERSEAS

[Value in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1950-54 program					Proposed fiscal year 1955 program	
	Spaces programmed	Value	Spaces completed	Value	Spaces in training	Spaces programmed	Value
Total:							
Formal training.....	39,203	241,739.1	25,552	79,634.3	3,808	20,575	36,699.0
Other training.....		23,482.7		11,144.5			9,508.1
Army:							
Formal training.....	7,089	6,097.1	5,848	4,420.4	211	2,427	3,033.9
Other training.....		3,779.7		2,381.0			4,784.2
Navy:							
Formal training.....	13,602	46,440.5	9,219	19,624.7	2,044	1,730	8,281.6
Other training.....		4,706.2		1,998.1			1,425.4
Air Force:							
Formal training.....	18,512	189,201.5	10,485	55,589.2	1,553	16,418	25,383.5
Other training.....		14,996.8		6,765.4			3,298.5

NOTE.—Totals based on unrounded figures hence may vary from totals of rounded amounts.

Department of Defense, MDAP as of Mar. 31, 1954—Latin America

VALUE OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS CHARGEABLE TO APPROPRIATIONS

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1950-54	Fiscal year 1954	Proposed fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1950-55
Total.....	104.2	23.7	13.0	117.2
Materiel.....	93.8	16.1	5.1	98.9
Equipment and supplies.....	(87.2)	(14.7)	(3.8)	(91.0)
Other materiel charges.....	(6.6)	(1.4)	(1.3)	(7.8)
Training.....	5.5	3.7	2.9	8.4
Other (specify).....				
Other, P. C. H. and T.....	4.9	3.9	5.1	10.0

Department of Defense, MDAP as of Mar. 31, 1954—Latin America—Continued

VALUE OF PROGRAMS FOR EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years 1950-54 program				Fiscal year 1954 program		Proposed fiscal year 1955 program	
	Shipped		To be shipped					
	Charged to appropriation	Excess	Chargeable to appropriation	Excess	Chargeable to appropriation	Excess	Chargeable to appropriation	Excess
Total.....	30.1	62.9	57.1	6.4	14.7	2.6	3.8	3.0
Army.....	21.2	1.1	26.7	1.8	1.8	.2	1.0	
Navy.....	4.7	52.8	13.1		6.5		1.2	
Air Force.....	4.2	9.0	17.3	4.6	6.4	2.4	1.6	3.0

TRAINING PROGRAMS—UNITED STATES AND OVERSEAS

[Value in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1950-54 program					Proposed fiscal year 1955 program	
	Spaces programed	Value	Spaces completed	Value	Spaces in training	Spaces programed	Value
Total:							
Formal training.....		55.0		30.0		488	666.6
Other training.....		5,410.1		1,333.6			2,231.0
Army:							
Formal training.....						488	666.6
Other training.....		377.2		8.3			1,333.4
Navy:							
Formal training.....		55.0		30.0			
Other training.....		4,720.9		1,325.3			897.6
Air Force:							
Formal training.....							
Other training.....		312.0					

NOTE.—Totals based on unrounded figures hence may vary from totals of rounded amounts.

Department of Defense, MDAP as of Mar. 31, 1954—Far East and Pacific

VALUE OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS CHARGEABLE TO APPROPRIATIONS

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1950-54	Fiscal year 1954	Proposed fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1950-55
Total.....	2,489.6	838.5	583.6	3,073.2
Materiel.....	2,331.8	765.2	521.1	2,852.9
Equipment and supplies.....	(2,281.5)	(760.4)	(511.0)	(2,792.5)
Other materiel charges.....	(50.3)	(4.9)	(10.1)	(60.4)
Training.....	40.7	22.3	20.7	61.4
Other (specify).....				
Other P. C. H. and T.....	117.1	51.0	41.8	159.0

VALUE OF PROGRAMS FOR EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1950-54 program				Fiscal year 1954 program		Proposed fiscal year 1955 program	
	Shipped		To be shipped					
	Charged to appropriation	Excess	Chargeable to appropriation	Excess	Chargeable to appropriation	Excess	Chargeable to appropriation	Excess
Total.....	1,219.3	107.6	1,062.3	26.8	760.4	24.0	511.0	9.9
Army.....	857.1	57.7	625.5	1.4	477.4		292.9	
Navy.....	157.1	15.2	118.9	14.3	70.8	15.4	87.5	9.9
Air Force.....	205.1	34.7	317.9	11.1	212.2	8.6	130.6	

Department of Defense, MDAP as of Mar. 31, 1954—Far East and Pacific—Continued

TRAINING PROGRAMS—UNITED STATES AND OVERSEAS

[Value in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1950-54 program					Proposed fiscal year 1955 program	
	Spaces programed	Value	Spaces completed	Value	Spaces in training	Spaces programed	Value
Total:							
Formal training.....	8,488	124,940.8	6,405	16,246.9	1,460	13,105	13,838.2
Other training.....		11,838.2		5,649.2			6,898.0
Army:							
Formal training.....	4,393	14,885.1	3,099	9,904.8	658	1,865	6,629.1
Other training.....		6,901.4		3,528.4			4,066.1
Navy:							
Formal training.....	2,308	2,052.7	1,821	1,201.1	629	2,070	3,291.3
Other training.....		2,175.8		857.7			1,074.7
Air Force:							
Formal training.....	1,787	8,003.0	1,485	5,141.0	173	9,170	3,917.8
Other training.....		2,761.0		1,263.1			1,757.2

¹ Excludes \$3.9 million proposed program for 1 country.

NOTE.—Totals based on unrounded figures hence may vary from totals of rounded amounts.

TIME TO CALL ROLL ON FOREIGN-AID RECIPIENTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Nevada, it is time that this Nation called the roll on the recipients of its taxpayers' money, and ceased once and for all financing potential foes through intermediaries that we fondly call our allies.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Vote!

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Case	Ferguson
Anderson	Chavez	Flanders
Barrett	Clements	Fulbright
Beall	Cooper	George
Bennett	Cordon	Gillette
Bowring	Crippa	Goldwater
Bricker	Daniel	Gore
Bridges	Dirksen	Green
Burke	Douglas	Hayden
Butler	Dworshak	Hendrickson
Capehart	Ellender	Hennings
Carlson	Ervin	Hickenlooper

Hill	Magnuson	Reynolds
Holland	Malone	Robertson
Humphrey	Mansfield	Russell
Ives	Martin	Saltonstall
Jackson	Maybank	Smathers
Jenner	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Johnson, Colo.	McCarthy	Smith, N. J.
Johnson, Tex.	McClellan	Sparkman
Johnston, S. C.	Millikin	Stennis
Kennedy	Monroney	Symington
Kerr	Morse	Thye
Knowland	Mundt	Upton
Kuchel	Murray	Watkins
Langer	Pastore	Welker
Lehman	Payne	Wiley
Lennon	Potter	Young
Long	Purtell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] are absent by leave of the Senate. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

I announce further than on this vote the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—67

Aiken	Green	McClellan
Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bowring	Hennings	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Burke	Hill	Murray
Butler	Holland	Pastore
Carlson	Humphrey	Payne
Chavez	Ives	Potter
Clements	Jackson	Purtell
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Crippa	Kerr	Smathers
Daniel	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Sparkman
Ellender	Lennon	Stennis
Ervin	Long	Symington
Ferguson	Magnuson	Thye
Flanders	Mansfield	Upton
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	
Gore	McCarran	

NAYS—19

Barrett	Goldwater	Reynolds
Bennett	Jenner	Russell
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Watkins
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Welker
Case	Langer	Young
Dworshak	Malone	
Gillette	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—10

Bush	Frear	Schoeppel
Byrd	Kefauver	Williams
Duff	Kilgore	
Eastland	Neely	

So the bill (H. R. 9678) was passed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WILEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. GREEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS subsequently said: Mr. President, I had intended to make a short statement prior to the vote on the measure just passed by the Senate, but I was temporarily out of the chamber, and the vote came sooner than I anticipated, and for that reason I desire to make the statement I had prepared.

Mr. President, I regret that I could not with good conscience vote for the Mutual Security Act of 1954. In previous years, I have voted for both the military and the economic assistance acts. It is evident that nearly \$10 billion of previous appropriations for assistance have not been expended and are now available for use in connection with these two programs. There is ample authority for expenditures where most needed, and this bill is not needed for the purpose of giving additional authority.

The history of the last few years demonstrates that we are not winning friends and allies with the expenditure of moneys in their behalf. The collective defense program has already failed in two important instances. In Korea our allies left us practically alone in defending that country, and when the chips were down in Indochina, there were no volunteers from our allies to aid in holding that area. There is mounting evidence that should a showdown come in Europe between the Communists and the free world, most of our important allies will remain neutral rather than take up arms against the foe.

In Indochina we will be lucky if we retrieve 10 percent of the military supplies that we have given to the forces fighting the Communists. We are simply not winning with our program of giving to our allies. At home we are carrying almost intolerable burdens to rearm ourselves and provide for the defense of the nations who are allied with us. It is about time we took stock; it is about time we should make "that agonizing reappraisal" that Secretary Dulles has spoken of.

There are many items in the present bill that I can support, but there are many others that I believe are indefensible in view of our present economic situation. I could elaborate at great length on my reasons for voting against this measure. I could describe the situation as I found it in Europe in a 3-month visit last year. The rosy promises for NATO are not being fulfilled. The trend is all the other way. In Asia we have been fighting nothing but rearguard actions ever since the infamous Yalta agreement. As a protest, Mr. President, against the utter waste of our taxpayers' money I felt compelled to vote against this bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. 1244. An act relating to the renewal of star-route and screen vehicle service contracts;

S. 2027. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue quitclaim deeds to the States for certain lands;

S. 2389. An act to amend the act of December 3, 1942;

S. 2453. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to implementing the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea relating to radio equipment and radio operators on board ship;

S. 2864. An act to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the North Unit irrigation district, to authorize construction of Haystack Reservoir on the Deschutes Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

S. 3464. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to make certain provision for the carrying out of the Agreement for the Promotion of Safety on the Great Lakes by Means of Radio;

S. 3681. An act to authorize the Civil Service Commission to make available group life insurance for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service, and for other purposes;

S. 3697. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1937, as amended, to include cooperation with the Governments of Canada or Mexico or local Canadian or Mexican authorities for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases;

S. 3699. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Louisiana and Texas and relating to the waters of the Sabine River;

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to repeal certain World War II laws relating to return of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution designating the month of September 1955 as John Marshall Bicentennial Month, and creating a commission to supervise and direct the observance of such month.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House numbered 1 and 3 to the bill (S. 3137) to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said Act, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3546) to provide an immediate program for the modernization and improvement of such merchant-type vessels in the reserve fleet as are necessary for national defense, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TOLLEFSON, Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. RAY, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. SHELLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6310) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to exempt operations in the transportation of livestock, fish, and agricultural, floricultural, and horticultural commodities from the act and from regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 3344) to amend the mineral leasing laws and the mining laws

to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 3, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 3344. An act to amend the mineral leasing laws and the mining laws to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; and

S. 3683. An act to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 6310. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to exempt operations in the transportation of livestock, fish, and agricultural, floricultural, and horticultural commodities from the act and from regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9712. An act granting the consent of Congress to certain New England States to enter into a compact relating to higher education in the New England States and establishing the New England Board of Higher Education; placed on the calendar.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHOSE LANDS HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY FLUCTUATIONS IN LEVEL OF LAKE OF THE WOODS, MINN.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2098) to provide for determining the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods, Minn. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2098) to provide for determining the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods, Minn., having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments and agree to the same.

PRESCOTT BUSH,
J. GLENN BEALL,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
EDGAR A. JONAS,
USHER L. BURDICK,
THOMAS J. LANE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENSE RESERVE OF TANKERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2408) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report. It is a unanimous report. I have cleared it with both the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2408) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

After the words "The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to pay the cost of national defense features incorporated in any such new tanker" strike out the words "and which are not used by the owner or operator".

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN M. BUTLER,
CHARLES E. POTTER,
FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr.,
HERBERT C. BONNER,
JOHN F. SHELLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PROTECTION OF THE NAME OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION FROM COMMERCIAL EXPLOITATION

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, would the Senator consider taking up a very noncontroversial matter pertaining to the FBI?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I prefer not to have the bill he is interested in taken up for two reasons. First, I have given a commitment that there would be no

legislation moved in between the consideration of the mutual security bill and the farm bill, with the exception of the supplemental appropriation bill, which I hope we can complete tonight.

I will say to the Senator from Nevada that we will give a priority consideration to his bill once the farm bill is disposed of, but I do not want to open the door to other proposed legislation. I think personally that the bill in which the Senator is interested is a good measure, from what I know about it. I think it will pass on the unanimous-consent calendar on Saturday. But I do not want to start now to take bills up by unanimous consent for fear of delaying the farm bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this will not take over 2 minutes. If it does, I will withdraw it. It will take 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would prefer if the Senator would permit us to proceed with the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2055, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1955, H. R. 9936.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill H. R. 9936, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REYNOLDS in the chair). The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

CHAPTER I DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA Operating expenses

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I inquire whether we are to have a statement regarding the bill, or are we merely proceeding item by item?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was about to ask that the amendments of the committee be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as amended be considered as the original text for the purpose of further amendment, and that all points of order against committee amendments be reserved to any Senator having a desire to make a point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, before we proceed to the subject I should like to be recognized so that I may speak on the bill itself. Naturally, if the chairman wishes to lead off the discussion, I am perfectly willing to have him speak first.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire has no reason to prolong the debate on the bill. Perhaps the

speech of the Senator from Illinois might better come after he hears what is contained in the bill. However, if he wishes to speak first, that is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. This is the last supplemental appropriation bill to come before Congress. The bill contains a substantial increase over the House figure. I shall explain why that is so.

To begin with, approximately \$525 million of the increase is for the military program; \$350 million is for the Air Force and the Navy. That amount is explained in this way: The House wrote into the bill a provision that the money should be taken from unobligated funds. However, there are no funds that are unobligated and unprogramed for particular programs which are essential to the defense of the country. That item amounts to approximately \$350 million.

One hundred and seventy-five million dollars is for the construction of military housing. If there is any problem which is serious in our camps and on our bases, not only in this country but all over the world, it is the problem of housing for both officers and enlisted men in the armed services. Some housing is privately constructed under the provisions of the Wherry Act. Also there is some public housing. Nevertheless, this country, in order to keep men in its armed services, maintain enlistments, and retain its younger commissioned officers in the services as well as its non-commissioned officers and enlisted men, must make provision for military housing.

Therefore, a very substantial part of the increase in the Senate bill over the House bill is accounted for by the appropriation of new funds for housing and of new funds, rather than unobligated funds, for military construction.

One of the other large items is \$37,500,000, for construction of tankers. That item was not considered by the House. There is also an item of \$27 million for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which was not considered by the House.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The testimony showed that the construction of military housing would save money to the taxpayers, because a certain amount of money is paid to officers in the form of a quarters allowance. If the officers can live in Government-provided houses, they are not paid an allowance for quarters. In other words, the program will amortize itself in 10 years, and from then on the taxpayers will save money. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Another large item in the bill is \$35 million for hospital construction, to which the Senate committee added \$19,300,000. For this purpose the House provided \$15,700,000.

Another large item is \$25,400,000 for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service ad-

ministration. I have mentioned these large items, all of which I believe are essential, and with respect to which the Senate committee has added funds to the House figures.

In some instances the committee action resulted in figures lower than the House figures, while in other instances this action resulted in higher amounts than the House figures.

It is a big bill. There are hundreds of items in it. As any question arises with reference to a particular amendment, the Senator from New Hampshire will attempt to explain and justify it.

I now ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc—

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. I make the point of order that on page 25, beginning at line 14, the amendment of the committee is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair requests the Senator from Maryland to withhold his point of order momentarily.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as the original text for the purpose of further amendment, but that all points of order against the committee amendments be reserved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving my right to object, this is a very extraordinary bill which the Committee on Appropriations has reported to the Senate. We have just finished consideration of all the regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1955. Now the Committee on Appropriations brings in a bill for an additional \$2,015,000,000.

Looking over some of these items, it seems to me that they should have been included in the regular budget, and that the administration, and the officials of the Bureau of the Budget, and those in the executive offices of the President should have made up their minds about them at the time the regular budget was submitted.

I invite attention to the fact that on page 40 of the report, for example, there is a request for \$380 million for strategic and critical materials. That item may be highly desirable, but why could it not have been foreseen at the time the regular budget was submitted?

We also find, on page 41 of the report, a request for \$18 million for public facility loans.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the authorization for the \$18 million was contained in an amendment which was adopted by the Senate to the public housing bill, which the President signed only yesterday. That is why it could not have been brought up previously.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That may well be. On page 29 there is an item for \$6½ million for forest roads and trails.

On page 13 there is an item for about \$8 million for a census of business, manufactures, and mineral industries. Then there are large appropriations for military housing, running into hundreds of millions of dollars.

There is naturally raised the question as to whether these items were withheld when the budget was submitted in order that we might have a low figure before us, so that it could be said that economies were being effected, in comparison with past budgets and appropriations, and then, when everyone's guard was down, and the regular appropriation bills had been passed, the administration could submit a supplemental appropriation bill amounting to \$2 billion.

Mr. President, I think these items should be scrutinized with some care. The administration has been guilty of very bad fiscal practice in withholding these items and then pushing them through at the end of the session. These costs could have been foreseen and the requests could have been submitted previously. Now, at the last minute, when our guard is down, the \$2 billion appropriation bill comes rushing through. I think we should scrutinize these items very carefully.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts when I have finished my statement. An administration that prides itself on its budgeting procedure should not be guilty of this type of performance.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to refer to two instances. One of them is the Housing and Home Finance Agency. No money was provided for this Agency in the regular Independent Offices appropriation bill—and I so stated when the bill was under debate in the Senate—because there was a bill pending in the Committee on Banking and Currency, which was a new bill—

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask whether the Senator is referring to the item covered on page 32 of the report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Page 39 of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At page 42 of the report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Page 42 of the report; yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is chickenfeed. That is only \$6½ million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I add one further item—the one relating to ship construction? That is another new item which was brought into the bill. It was not provided for in the regular appropriation bill, because the entire ship-construction program was then being considered. There is quite a comprehensive merchant-marine program involved. Those are only two items about which I know.

There are also a number of items of new legislation with relation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but I would rather not go into those, because they are outside my province.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Apparently the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Massachusetts do not agree,

because the chairman is defending the supplemental budget despite the criticism which his own committee advanced. I invite the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the following statement on page 3 of the committee report:

The committee wishes to state emphatically that it does not look with favor upon this large number of supplemental and deficiency requests made by the departments and agencies of the Government. The committee recognizes the necessity under certain emergency conditions for supplemental appropriations, but is at a loss to understand why the establishments of the Federal Government cannot present most supplemental items during the consideration of the regular bills.

The lateness of these presentations places a heavy burden on the committee in its attempt to examine carefully and fully the requests submitted. Therefore, it is the hope of the committee that the agencies involved will discourage this practice without further admonition from the Congress.

I submit that that is a slap on the wrist, and a very mild one indeed. What I really would like to point out is the gross negligence, to put it mildly, of the administrative agencies in withholding these items from the regular budget and then putting them in a supplemental budget. Everyone knows that not much attention is paid to the supplemental budget. Headlines are made on the basis of the regular budget. The administration claims economies in the regular budget, and then puts back with the left hand what it claims it was taking away with the right hand. That is a violation of every sound procedure in developing the Federal budget.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I point out two other items which come within my personal knowledge to a considerable extent. One is military construction. The Senator is aware that when the Defense Department appropriation bill was passed, all military construction items were distinctly left out because the military construction bill had not been passed on, and that fact was emphasized at that time. That is more than half the present bill. It amounts to about a billion dollars in a \$2-billion bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why could not the military budget have been submitted at the usual time? Why was that held out and pushed in at the end of the last session? It is well known that there are scandals in the construction of military housing and that costs for military housing are extremely high.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Because the authorization bill was before the House, the items were being scrutinized with care. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and his subcommittee—the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]—took more than 2 months to go through the authorization bill and cut it down very substantially. I mention those items to the Senator from Illinois

because I think he will find, if he examines the bill carefully and in detail, that almost all these items are new items, new legislation. It was stated unequivocally on the floor of the Senate when the regular appropriation bills were passed that these items would be considered later.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask why they were not considered at the time the regular budget was submitted? Why is it that we have this last-minute move, involving items of a billion dollars, \$380 million, \$175 million, and so on? Certainly the great business brains that have been drawn into the service of the Government should be able to submit their estimates on time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more statement or question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have just been informed that the \$1,100,000,000 for housing was submitted in January.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was it included in the regular budget?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was submitted as an authorization bill in January. The House spent several months going over it. The Senator from South Dakota can inform the Senator from Illinois how many months his committee took. That was the authorization bill. We could not put the appropriations in the regular bill because the authorization bill had not been passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It could have been included on a tentative basis in the appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So far as I know, we have not done that. Actually, the authorization bill for housing is on the Senate Calendar today in the same amount as is included in the appropriation bill. I point those things out because I know the Senator wants to be fair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I do.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator from Illinois know whether or not the administration, when speaking of the deficit for this year, gave consideration to this \$2 billion?

Mr. DOUGLAS. When they compared their budget figures with the budget estimates of President Truman, they took the budget estimate of President Truman for 1953-54, of \$77 billion, and compared their estimate for 1954-55 with the Truman budget, and then said, "We are cutting it down by this amount." Now they come in with a \$2 billion supplemental appropriation which diminishes the difference by \$2 billion; and there will be still more supplemental appropriations. If a supplemental appropriation bill is submitted before the regular session ends, let us see what will happen when the next Congress convenes. There will be still more supplemental appropriations.

Mr. President, I have fought for economy on the floor of this body when my party was in power, and I think I am entitled to fight for economy when the other party is in power, particularly

when such an extraordinary budget as the present one is submitted.

Mr. President, in terms of expenditures, if my figures are correct, in the year 1951-52 the Federal Government spent approximately \$65.2 billion. That was the last full year of the Truman administration. In the first full year of the Eisenhower administration, if my information is correct, the Government spent approximately \$67.3 billion, or \$2 billion more.

Some of these claims for economy are hokum, and I do not believe in hokum. I hate hypocrisy worse than anything else in the world, and I do not believe in letting the hokum pass as economy.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Is the Senator aware of the fact that when the present administration took over about \$80 billion of appropriations expenditures were authorized and that to a large extent the military construction program is being financed by the reapplication of prior appropriations? In large part the expenditures for military construction in the Army, Navy, and Air Force are being financed by reprogramming or reapplication of old appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That always happens.

Mr. CASE. Not to the extent that it is happening now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not the very fact the Senator from South Dakota brings out reveal some of the discrepancies between figures? The truth is that in the early days of the Korean war the Congress, with the assistance of the Truman administration, appropriated billions and billions of dollars, and that much of that money could not be expended in that period of time, and had to be programmed, as we were told here this afternoon, under the foreign-aid bill. It seems to me that the administration is very much like the son of the rich man—living off the old man's wealth. They are sort of sucking it out of the pipeline. I emphasize the point made in the question asked by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. Does the deficit include the \$2,100,000,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. The deficit which has been published is for the past fiscal year, July 1, 1953, to July 1, 1954.

What I am saying, however, is that the administration has taken credit for reducing appropriations for 1954-55 as compared to the Truman budget for 1953-54, and they showed a very respectable reduction in terms of the budget which they submitted in January. However, we now find a \$2 billion "joker" suddenly appearing.

I suppose this body will pass the "joker." There are so many items in the bill which the people want that we shall have to pass the bill. But I think it ought to be exposed for what it is.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. CASE. My understanding is that the actual expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, showed a deficit of \$3,025,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is correct.

Mr. CASE. As compared with a prospective deficit under the Truman program of \$6,890,000,000. The deficit was approximately \$4 billion less than the Truman forecast.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The budget of \$77 billion which President Truman submitted we all knew had a lot of water in it. We all knew it would be cut down by the Appropriations Committee.

Therefore, the comparison which is made between the budget submitted and the deficit projected and the deficit actually incurred is a very disingenuous comparison.

I point out that the budget was not balanced; there was a deficit of \$3 billion. However, I am not addressing myself to the year 1953-54 at the moment. I am only saying that for the year 1954-55 it now looks as though a highly imperfect budget was submitted in January, because items were held out which should have been put in the budget, and they now reappear in the supplemental bill, when it is thought people will not notice them.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. CASE. In view of the fact that there was so much water in the Truman budget, would not the Senator have been delighted had he been able to wring out some of it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a great deal of water in this budget. The H₂O content is extremely high.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It seems to me they threw out part of the sink, too. I think if a person were to go back over the defense budget of the previous fiscal year he would find that the administration had reversed itself, particularly in connection with airpower. We had to correct that action this year; but it is no correction at all, because the lag time in that connection cannot be reclaimed. Some of these days we shall wake up to learn that our schedule of airplane production is on the descent rather than the ascent.

Some time ago I read a report showing that our plane production position was directly opposite from that of the Soviets; and as the Soviet production goes up our production starts coming down.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is undoubtedly true that the administration, in cutting the Air Force program last year and then restoring it this year, lost at least a year of time, and possibly, in the training of men, 2 years of time. Now they are doing the same thing, of course, with the ground forces. A large part of the alleged saving, which appeared in January in the regular budget, resulted from cutting the number of divisions and in general curtailing the physical strength of the Army.

But all that is beside the point. What I am trying to say is that there were false and fictitious claims of economy, not wholly based on fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Several days ago on this floor the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] presented some interesting statistical evidence on the budget of the Post Office Department, which I think is typical of a departmental budget as compared to an overall budget. Much of the economy which has been claimed for the Post Office Department is an economy which has been made available by clever sleight-of-hand performance by accountants in the respective agencies of Government.

In other words, the airline subsidy is no longer being paid by the Post Office Department. The franking privileges, which were frequently bookkeeping transactions before, are now being charged against various departments.

The Senator from South Carolina pointed out, if I am not mistaken—and the Senator is here and can correct me if I am—that actually there was no saving at all. Despite the increased revenue, despite the so-called efficiency, and despite all the efforts to bring into the administration the great new science of business-management principles, we were no better off than we had been before; and everyone knows that the Post Office Department was worse off. Everybody knows that the mail service is worse.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is also true that in connection with the regular budgets which have been submitted, claims of economy have been made. No appropriations have been made for the purpose of paying ultimate obligations, notably in connection with the pension fund; so the obligation continues, but the financial provision for it has been omitted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is that not true with regard to the social-security fund?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is true.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois, in all fairness, since I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, that many members of that committee feel exactly the same as does the Senator from Illinois on this question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted to hear that. In other words, the Senator from Washington does not thoroughly agree with the Senator from Massachusetts in saying—

God's in His heaven—
All's right with the world.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; we do not feel that way in connection with this particular fiscal policy. But we did find, regardless of how these items were presented—and I think many of them should have been presented in the regular budget—that they are items which must be taken care of.

I thought, as did the Senator from Illinois, that this was a thoroughly unbusinesslike transaction, when it was announced to the people of this country on July 1, with great fanfare, that the deficit was only three billion-so-many-million dollars when, as a matter of fact, sooner or later, there must be added to that figure the \$2 billion due to book-keeping, and when there must be added \$3 billion in connection with foreign aid. Those two items total \$5 billion. Also there must be added an item to cover the postponement of payments, which item does not appear in the budget.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. That is what I said.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is almost \$2 billion in the social-security program. Adding that sum, the total is \$7 billion, which must be added to the \$3 billion.

Actually, in the overall picture, if there is not a cutoff date of July 1, the overall deficit will be closer to \$8 billion or \$10 billion than \$3 billion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is for the coming year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For the coming year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think many members of the Appropriations Committee did not like this procedure. Nevertheless, there are many items in the bill which require appropriations. They are items which should have been in the regular budget. With respect to some of them, it is true, there was no opportunity to present them.

The Senator from Massachusetts, I believe, spoke about the ship item. That item could have been presented in the regular budget. Again that was a case of government by postponement, with continual study of this, that, and the other thing.

When this results in a figure of \$3 billion, it is much too low. I saw a cartoon of George Humphrey climbing up a precipice which was named "Balanced Budget," and the wording was "Keep going, George; you are about to make it." After he is through with these figures, he will be down at the bottom again.

I do not know who is at fault, but I resented, as did many other members of the Appropriations Committee, the fanfare and hullabaloo about how businesslike all this was. We hear about the "terrible spendthrift Democrats." We are told, "Look at us; we are within \$3 billion of balancing the budget," when that is not true.

I think in fairness to the Appropriations Committee—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not blaming the Appropriations Committee. I am blaming the Bureau of the Budget and the executive office of the President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have only one further comment. I intended to say about the same thing the Senator from Illinois is saying. However, we were presented with a problem about which we could not do much. I think it was wrongly handled, but we had to appropriate the money.

When we start figuring it up, the deficit will be closer to \$8 billion or \$10 billion.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. As was so well stated by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, in my opinion the budget as it was presented to the Congress in the first place was misleading; and in the second place, the additional items totaling more than \$2 billion should have been foreseen and could have been foreseen.

If the Senator from Illinois will permit, I should like to cite one instance which I think very clearly illustrates what has happened. This is a small item, but nonetheless it is significant as showing exactly what has been done.

The 1954 appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Immigration and Naturalization Service was \$42,250,000. The 1955 appropriation was \$39 million, or a decrease of \$3,250,000.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and I am sure many of my other colleagues, may remember that on the floor of the Senate I pointed out what would happen because of this decrease, and I pleaded for an additional \$3,250,000, which would have brought the appropriation merely up to the point where it had been the year before. I pointed out that unless we made such an appropriation, the work of apprehending and deporting "wetbacks" illegally entering the United States would be impossible of consummation. But, no; it was maintained that all they wanted was \$39 million. They had examined the situation carefully, and that \$39 million was sufficient to take care of the needs. Today in the supplementary appropriation bill I find that there has been included an item of \$3 million, which was exactly the amount I asked for; and pointed out was the amount necessary, months ago. Those in authority should have known about that. They could have known about it, but they did not. In my opinion, they wanted to make a show of economy; and it was merely a show. No real economy was involved in this item and many other items with which we are dealing in the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to join in what the Senator from Illinois has said. I want the RECORD to be clear that until the present bill came before the Senate, we had reduced appropriations a billion and a half dollars below the budget estimates. I am sure my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, will remember that I offered an amendment to increase the authorization for the Air Force. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and other Senators offered amendments to increase authorizations for the Army. I stated at that time on the floor of the Senate that we might as well be prepared for a deficit. There is a deficit of a billion dollars represented in the bill. I do not say it is right, but what else could the committee do? The program has been delayed.

The Senate had an opportunity this afternoon to decrease the authorization for foreign aid expenditures by \$1 billion, but it voted against such a decrease. So we are to have a deficit as a result of the foreign aid bill. There will be a deficit of \$7 billion as a result of the farm program, and surplus farm commodities will be shipped to Europe. When an authorization bill is brought to the floor of the Senate, we are urged to vote for it.

Thank God, I voted this afternoon to reduce the authorization for the foreign aid program by \$1 billion. I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for some time. The only Senator on the other side of the aisle who has been a member of the Appropriations Committee as long as I have is the distinguished chairman [Mr. BRIDGES]. I know he does not believe in this sort of procedure. Neither do I. Authorizations were made for ships to be built, and for wetbacks to be taken back to the Mexican border. There is no use in sending wetbacks back to the border, because they will be back in Texas the next morning. Senators voted for various bills, such as authorizations for the building of merchant ships, air bases, and other activities. Then when an appropriation bill is brought before the Senate for action, the Committee on Appropriations is severely criticized. That is all I wished to say. I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois prefaced his remarks by reserving the right to object. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if objection is made, the only procedure left is to take up the amendments one by one. I should like to point out to my colleagues that the Committee on Appropriations has spent hour after hour, day after day, and week after week on the bill. The members of the committee and the staff have worked 14 or 16 hours a day. We have gone into all the items. The Senator from New Hampshire himself wrote the summary of the report which is on page 3, wherein he admonished the departments of Government that he felt it was too late to get many of these items before the committee. The Senator from New Hampshire was well aware of that. Nevertheless, the Government of the United States must function. When the construction authorization bill, which provided for the lifeline of the United States, was not acted on and was not authorized, and when the housing-construction bill for military personnel who defend this country, was not acted on, the only thing the Senator from New Hampshire and the committee could do was to hear the evidence as it was presented. That is what the committee did, and the report was written. Statements have been made which, to say the least, were not called for.

Mr. President, I call for the regular order, and call up the committee amendments, beginning with the first one.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to state for the Record that I consider that the Committee on Appropriations, under the distinguished leadership of the Senator from New Hampshire, this year has done one of the most outstanding jobs in the legislative history of Congress. That statement has been made heretofore. Appropriation bills were disposed of expeditiously. There is now before the Senate a supplemental appropriation bill because certain items were not previously authorized. The Senate was not able to act until today on the foreign-aid bill. Nevertheless, the committee worked on that bill because the Senator from New Hampshire anticipated what had to be done.

As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I should like to make a very brief statement regarding my attitude on certain important items which were, unfortunately, overlooked by the House. A number of items in the bill breathe life into programs which were considered and reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and which have become law during this session of Congress. Some of these items were overlooked by the House. The bill contains grants to States to hold conferences of educators and lay citizens to discuss educational problems and make recommendations for appropriate action at local, State, and Federal levels in regard to our school problems. The bill also contains a grant for administrative expenses of the White House Conference on Education, which the President urged so strongly. It also contains an appropriation for a National Advisory Committee on Education.

The bill provides \$6 million to finance the beginning of the expanded vocational rehabilitation program recommended by the President, which was signed today. I had the honor to be present when the bill was signed. It is one of the most important bills in the field of health and rehabilitation of our disabled people that has ever been passed. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] who had a great part in obtaining passage of the bill is present at this time.

The bill contains an additional \$1,831,000 for grants for vocational rehabilitation training and traineeships, and \$400,000 to finance the expansion of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

The demand throughout the country for the rehabilitation program has been pressing all year. The bill has been controversial. Differences with the House of Representatives were finally resolved and the bill was signed today.

The items in the bill represent an overall total of \$8,231,000 to carry forward the expanded vocational rehabilitation program recommended by the Eisenhower administration. This is the first expansion of the program undertaken in recent years, and it is planned to expand it further in the future.

The bill also contains an authorization of \$35 million of additional funds for the United States Public Health Service

to cover the expanded hospital construction program recommended by the President and recently authorized by the Congress. These funds will be available for the construction of diagnostic and treatment centers, chronic disease hospitals, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes. They are needed in the United States, and yet action on such items was withheld in the House. The Senator from New Hampshire and his committee saw the importance of such legislation and added those items to the bill.

Earmarked Federal assistance for the construction of such health facilities has not heretofore been available. The \$35 million item, an additional \$300,000 item to cover administrative expenses, and \$2 million item for State surveys, provide one of the cornerstones in President Eisenhower's health program.

I regret to note that the bill does not appropriate funds for cooperative research in education.

The committee states, however, that funds for this aspect of the President's program in regard to education can await presentation in the next annual budget. It is my hope that such funds will be provided in the next Congress.

Mr. President, the funds provided by this bill for the items I have mentioned are necessary if we are to carry forward the President's program. In that respect, this appropriation bill is as much a part of the program of the President as is the substantive legislation which authorized the various items to which I have referred.

Again, Mr. President, I commend the action of the Appropriations Committee; and I congratulate the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. The Senate and, in fact, the entire country are greatly indebted to him for the extremely difficult work he and his committee have performed. They have worked tirelessly and most effectively, and I desire to express to him and to the other members of the committee the profound thanks of all of us.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for that pat on the back. All the members of the committee, Democrats and Republicans alike, have worked very hard. Few persons realize the long hours, days, weeks, and months the members of the committee devote to this work. It is a public service that is outstanding.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say that no one appreciates more than I do what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the chairmen of the subcommittees of that committee have done. But I must say that the negligence on the part of the administration is what has brought about the \$2 billion supplemental appropriation bill which is before us tonight.

I admire tremendously the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. However, long ago I recognized what would develop. I said to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that it would

be necessary to have supplemental appropriation bill items for the Air Force. I said that, in fact, a way back in February, in speaking on the floor of the Senate.

However, I must point out that the bill has been reported unanimously by the committee. I appreciate the excellent work the committee has done, and the long hours the committee has spent on its task, in the performance of its duty.

On the other hand, I regret that the administration has put off this matter, even though it knew that additional appropriations would be required.

For instance, Mrs. Hobby well knew what appropriations were needed for her Department; and Secretary Talbott well knew what appropriations were needed for the Air Force; and so did other Department heads. The fault is with the administration.

I realize full well that the administration will have to run for reelection. I myself have to run for office in November. So I do not blame them for being afraid.

The truth is that the chairman of the committee and the chairmen of the subcommittees appointed by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] have worked long and hard. It is equally true that every member of the committee on this side of the aisle voted in the committee for every one of these appropriation items. I say most respectfully that the members of the committee who sit on this side of the aisle appreciate full well the splendid work the chairman of the committee has done.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire renew the request he previously made?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, Mr. President; I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois defer for a moment his reservation of the right to object?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], particularly as regards the work done by the Appropriations Committee. We often fall into the habit of abusing one another in connection with some of these measures; but my comments were not in that vein at all. I think the record is quite clear that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has brought out the appropriation bills on a time schedule that is really quite phenomenal. The committee has made it possible for the Senate to have opportunity to consider the bills and to debate and amend them. Certainly the facts bear out that statement.

Let me emphasize that any comment I have made in regard to the supplemental appropriation bill was not directed toward the tireless efforts of the chairman and the other members of the

Appropriations Committee. I pay my respects particularly to the chairman of the committee. I recall asking him, weeks ago, "Where have you been? You must have been in the catacombs or the salt mines." I said that because I realized full well that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is literally tied to the committee sessions day in and day out. I sympathize greatly with him.

Nevertheless, I think the Senator from South Carolina is giving us rather substantial information on a number of these appropriation items.

Let me say to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] that a number of the items sound very New Dealish. Of course, I rather like that. [Laughter.] I was wondering whether the spirit of the New Deal was walking through this Chamber again.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, does the Senator from Minnesota think that the only ones who have an interest in education and health are the New Dealers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all. As a matter of fact, I welcome the Senator from New Jersey into our social fraternity. It seems to me that the committee has reported some very splendid provisions dealing with items for which I myself have voted.

As a matter of fact, the proposed appropriation of \$6 million for vocational rehabilitation is a beginning; and I am pleased with the small tidbits which indicate compassion and concern with human welfare.

So I congratulate the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for moving even farther forward in the field of human endeavor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President reserving the right to object, I think the Senator from New Hampshire has been working very hard during the session, and undoubtedly the heat has made him extremely sensitive on this point, because I did not intend my remarks as a reflection upon my good friend, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, and I do not think it was necessary to make obeisances in his direction, to indicate my esteem and affection for him. I believe we should consider these matters on their merits. When any Senator raises a question about the procedure in the Executive Office of the President, I do not believe the Senator from New Hampshire should fly into a temper and indicate that his ego has been adversely affected.

I assure the Senator from New Hampshire that I have great respect for his ability and endeavor. But in connection with this bill we happen to be dealing with appropriations totaling \$2 billion; and I know that once the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc, it will be extremely difficult to delete any of them.

I regret that I have not had time to examine this bill, which my good friend, the senior Senator from New Hampshire and the other members of the committee have spent days and nights in

studying. However, as I proceeded to consider the bill, I found in it a few items which I am extremely reluctant to approve.

So will the Senator from New Hampshire agree that if the committee amendments are approved en bloc, that will not foreclose any Member from moving to strike out certain of the items? Would the Senator from New Hampshire regard it as a reflection upon his ability if the Senate of the United States were to say it should have some right of decision on the question of how \$2 billion should be appropriated and spent? Would that be regarded as a personal attack upon the chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that, in accordance with the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, any Senator will have the right to submit an amendment at any time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield; certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I notice that in the case of a number of items in the supplemental appropriation bill, the Senator from New Hampshire was kind enough to give us advance notice as under rule XL of the standing rules of the Senate. I refer particularly to an item relating to the Assistant Secretary of Labor. I understand we shall deal with that item on the basis of the requirement for a two-thirds vote in favor of suspension of the rule, inasmuch as that item proposes the addition of legislation to an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Chair restate the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the Senator from New Hampshire to restate the proposed agreement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask that the proposed agreement be read again by the clerk.

First, let me say to the Senator from Oregon that the proposed agreement provides for exactly what the Senator from Illinois has indicated he desires. I am sure that if he had listened earlier to the proposed agreement, he would not have had to raise any question about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend the Senator from New Hampshire that he read the proposed agreement with such rapidity that it was very difficult for us to tell what he was saying. I still reserve the right to object, because I made that reservation for bargaining purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thought the mind of the Senator from Illinois worked so rapidly that he certainly would grasp anything I might say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; my mind is not particularly rapid, and it is not anywhere near so rapid as the speech of the senior Senator from New Hampshire, particularly when he is trying to put through an appropriation bill at 6 o'clock in the evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read again.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendments, but that all points of order against the committee amendments be reserved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the agreement, as I understand it, is perfectly satisfactory. It affords me an opportunity to offer some amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. My amendments are related to the amendments reported by the committee; but with the committee amendments agreed to en bloc and being considered as the original text of the bill, my amendments, even though they affect the amendments of the committee, will be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is quite right.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as modified? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, after line 3, to insert:

"REGULATORY AGENCIES"

"For an additional amount for 'Regulatory agencies,' \$30,000, and the amount available under this head may be used to carry out the provisions of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (Public Law 389, 83d Cong.), approved June 8, 1954."

On page 2, after line 9, to insert:

"SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS"

"For the payment of claims in excess of \$250, approved by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), \$13,967."

On page 2, after line 14, to insert:

"JUDGMENTS"

"For the payment of final judgments rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in Senate Document No. 145 (83d Cong.), \$15,132, together with such further sums as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 percent on such judgments as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment."

On page 2, after line 22, to insert:

"AUDITED CLAIMS"

"For an additional amount for the payment of claims, certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or credited to the general fund of the District of Columbia as provided by law (D. C. Code, title 47, sec. 130a), being for the service of the fiscal year 1952 and prior fiscal years, as set forth in Senate Document No. 145 (83d Cong.), \$14,624, together with such further sums as may be necessary to pay the interest on audited claims for refunds at not exceeding 4 percent per annum as provided by law

(act of July 10, 1952, 66 Stat. 546, sec. 14d)."

On page 3, after line 10, to insert:

"DIVISION OF EXPENSES"

"The sums appropriated in this act for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years involved."

On page 3, line 17, in the heading, to change the chapter number from "I" to "II."

On page 3, after line 18, to insert:

"SENATE"

On page 3, after line 19, to insert:

"For payment to the estate of Hugh Butler, late a Senator from the State of Nebraska, \$12,500."

On page 3, after line 21, to insert:

"For payment to Clyde Roark Hoey, Jr., and Charles Aycock Hoey, sons, and Isabel Hoey Paul, daughter of Clyde R. Hoey, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, \$12,500."

At the top of page 4, to insert:

"For payment to Emily Nathalie Hunt, widow of Lester C. Hunt, late a Senator from the State of Wyoming, \$12,500."

On page 4, after line 3, to insert:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES"

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY"

"Office of the Secretary: For an additional amount for fiscal year 1955, \$11,725: *Provided*, That effective August 1, 1954, the basic annual compensation of the following positions shall be: Financial clerk \$7,320 in lieu of \$7,000; printing clerk \$5,400 in lieu of \$5,160; executive clerk \$4,380 in lieu of \$4,100; assistant to the majority and assistant to the minority at \$8,000 each in lieu of assistant to the minority at \$8,000."

On page 4, after line 13, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER"

"Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For an additional amount for fiscal year 1955, \$21,750: *Provided*, That effective August 1, 1954, the basic annual compensation of the following positions shall be: Assistant doorkeeper \$3,420 in lieu of \$3,040; messenger at card door \$3,420 in lieu of \$3,040; messenger acting as assistant doorkeeper \$2,760 and 2 messengers acting as assistant doorkeepers at \$2,580 each in lieu of 3 messengers acting as assistant doorkeepers at \$2,580 each; clerk, press gallery, \$1,800; chief janitor, \$3,540 in lieu of \$3,200; assistant chief janitor \$2,400 in lieu of \$2,220; foreman of duplicating department \$2,940 in lieu of clerk \$2,280; 3 cabinetmakers at \$2,520 each in lieu of 2 cabinetmakers at \$2,520 each and 1 cabinetmaker at \$2,460; file clerk \$1,980; 3 addressograph operators at \$2,220 each, 4 clerks at \$2,160 each and 12 machine operators at \$1,740 each in lieu of 5 clerks at \$2,160 each and 13 machine operators at \$1,740 each; 2 mimeograph operators at \$1,800 each and 29 laborers at \$1,620 each in lieu of 30 laborers at \$1,620 each; repairman \$2,460."

On page 5, after line 10, to insert:

"OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND THE MINORITY"

"Offices of the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority: For an additional amount, \$1,405: *Provided*, That effective August 1, 1954, the basic annual compensation of the clerk to the secretary for the majority and the clerk to the secretary for the minority shall be at a rate to be fixed by the respective secretaries, but not exceeding \$3,480 each."

On page 5, after line 19, to insert:

"OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS"

"For two clerical assistants, one for the majority whip and one for the minority whip, at \$2,520 basic each, \$9,140."

On page 5, after line 22, to insert:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE"

"Legislative reorganization: For an additional amount for 'Legislative reorganization,' \$25,000."

At the top of page 6, to insert:

"Reporting Senate proceedings: For an additional amount for 'Reporting Senate proceedings,' \$4,000."

On page 6, after line 2, to insert:

"Inquiries and Investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1954, \$60,000."

On page 6, after line 5, to insert:

"Miscellaneous items: For an additional amount for 'Miscellaneous items,' exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1954, \$45,000."

Under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 6, after line 12, to insert:

"For payment to Sarah F. Camp, widow of Albert S. Camp, late a Representative from the State of Georgia, \$12,500."

On page 6, after line 15, to strike out:

"CAPITOL POLICE"

"SALARIES, CAPITOL POLICE FORCE"

"For salaries of the United States Capitol Police Force, as authorized by H. R. 9413, Eighty-third Congress, \$175,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated for salaries of Capitol Police, United States Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955, shall be transferred to and merged with funds provided hereunder and administered as one fund."

At the top of page 7, to strike out:

"GENERAL EXPENSES"

"For an additional amount for 'General expenses,' including the purchase of one police motor vehicle, \$79,785."

Under the subhead "Architect of the Capitol," on page 7, after line 4, to insert:

"Salaries: For an additional amount for 'Salaries,' \$320: *Provided*, That effective August 1, 1954, the following position shall be placed in the following General Schedule grade of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the compensation therefor be fixed accordingly: Administrative officer, grade GS-13."

At the top of page 8, to insert:

"Senate Office Building: For an additional amount for 'Senate Office Building,' \$4,100: *Provided*, That, hereafter, the following positions under the Architect of the Capitol at the Senate Office Building shall be placed in the following General Schedule or Craft, Protective, and Custodial Schedule grades of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the compensation therefor be fixed accordingly: Custodian, grade GS-12; assistant custodian and chief clerk, grade GS-10; principal procurement clerk and storekeeper, grade GS-8; assistant procurement clerk and storekeeper, grade GS-6; 2 desk clerks, grade GS-7; 1 desk clerk, grade GS-6; 1 desk clerk, grade GS-5; 3 attendants, grade GS-6; 1 attendant, grade CPC-7."

On page 8, after line 13, to insert:

"ADDITIONAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR THE UNITED STATES SENATE"

"Construction and equipment of additional Senate Office Building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to continue to provide for the construction and equipment of a fireproof office building for the use of the United States Senate, in accordance with the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1029), \$6 million: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be obligated or expended for construction of the rear center wing of said building, from the ground floor up, provided for under the building plans heretofore approved by such Commission."

Under the heading "The Judiciary", on page 9, after line 14, to insert:

"SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES"

"Automobile for the Chief Justice: For purchase, exchange, lease, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, \$5,835."

At the top of page 10, to insert:

"SALARIES OF REFEREES"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries of referees', \$18,500 to be derived from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of the act of June 28, 1946, as amended (11 U. S. C. 68)."

On page 10, line 6, to change the chapter number from "II" to "III."

Under the heading "Department of State," on page 10, after line 10, to insert:

"INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES"

"For an additional amount of 'International Education Exchange Activities,' \$900,000."

On page 10, after line 17, to insert:

"PAYMENT TO FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY"

"For payment to the Federal Republic of Germany for the acquisition or construction of an Embassy in the District of Columbia, \$300,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon enactment of legislation set forth in either H. R. 9988 or S. 1573, 83d Congress."

Under the heading "Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration—Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities," on page 11, line 5, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$275,000" and insert "\$350,000."

Under the subhead "Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals," on page 11, line 9, after the word "marshals," to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$525,000."

Under the heading "Department of Commerce," on page 12, after line 5, to insert:

"BUREAU OF THE CENSUS"

"CENSUSES OF BUSINESS, MANUFACTURES, AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES"

"For expenses necessary for taking, compiling, and publishing the census of business, manufactures, and mineral industries as authorized by law, including personal services by contract or otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; and additional compensation of Federal employees temporarily detailed for fieldwork under this appropriation; \$8,430,000, to remain available until December 31, 1957."

Under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Administration", on page 12, after line 18, to insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' \$860,000."

On page 14, after line 8, to insert:

"WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT"

"Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport: For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, and protection of the Washington National Airport, including purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; \$1,350,000."

On page 14, after line 14, to insert:

"Construction, Washington National Airport: For an additional amount for 'Construction, Washington National Airport,' including additional loading gate positions and related paving; and expansion of gasoline and baggage facilities; \$635,000, to remain available until expended."

Under the subhead "Maritime Activities—Ship Construction", on page 15, line 8, after the figures "\$82,600,000", to strike out the colon and "Provided", and insert "to

remain available until expended: *Provided*, That transfers may be made to the appropriation for the current fiscal year for 'Salaries and expenses' for administrative expenses (not to exceed \$500,000) and for reserve fleet expenses and such amounts as may be required, and any such transfers shall be without regard to the limitations under that appropriation on the amounts available for such expenses."

On page 16, after line 8, to insert:

"BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION"

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' \$600,000."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Public Roads—Inter-American Highway", on page 16, line 16, after the word "Highway", to strike out "\$4,750,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

On page 16, after line 17, to insert:

"REIMBURSEMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA"

"For reimbursement to the Highway Fund, District of Columbia, for part cost of construction of highway-railroad grade separation structure in the District of Columbia on New York Avenue in the vicinity of South Dakota Avenue NE, \$290,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 6080, 83d Congress."

At the top of page 17, to insert:

"WEATHER BUREAU"

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' \$175,000."

On page 17, line 5, to change the chapter number from "III" to "IV."

Under the heading "Treasury Department," on page 17, after line 6, to insert:

"BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS"

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DIVISION OF DISBURSEMENT"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' \$500,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 9366 or similar legislation of the Eighty-third Congress."

Under the subhead "Internal Revenue Service", on page 17, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "\$8,750,000" and insert "\$7,750,000."

On page 18, line 19, to change the chapter number from "IV" to "V."

Under the heading "Department of Labor", on page 18, after line 20, to insert:

"BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS"

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' \$25,000; and the amount made available under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1955, for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, is increased from \$75,000 to \$100,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment during the Eighty-third Congress of legislation increasing the authorization for appropriations for such purpose."

On page 19, after line 6, to insert:

"BUREAU OF VETERANS REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS"

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' \$100,000."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Employment Security", on page 19, after line 11, to insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' \$145,000."

Under the subhead "Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration", on page 19, line 19, after the word "administration", to

strike out "\$4,600,000" and insert "\$30,000,000."

Under the subhead "Unemployment Compensation for Veterans", on page 20, line 5, after the word "veterans", to strike out "\$88,400,000" and insert "\$70,400,000."

On page 20, after line 5, to insert:

"UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES"

"For payments to unemployed Federal employees, either directly or through payments to States, as authorized by title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 20, after line 10, insert:

"UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, NEXT SUCCEEDING FISCAL YEAR"

"For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as may be required for payment to unemployed Federal employees for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, and the obligations and expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year."

On page 20, after line 19, to insert: "The two immediately preceding paragraphs in this act under the head 'Bureau of Employment Security' shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 9709, 83d Congress, except that \$896,000 of the appropriation for 'grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration' shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 9640 or S. 2759, 83d Congress."

On page 21, after line 2, to insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program,' \$350,000."

On page 21, after line 6, to insert:

"BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS"

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expense,' \$110,000."

Under the heading "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare," on page 21, after line 12, to insert:

"FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION"

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CERTIFICATION AND INSPECTION SERVICES"

"The paragraph under this head in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955, is amended to read as follows:

"Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspection of certain products in accordance with sections 406, 408, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346, 348, 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 375), the aggregate of the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover payments of fees by applicants for certification or inspection of such products, to remain available until expended. The total amount herein appropriated shall be available for personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; expenses of advisory committees; and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has been rendered."

On page 22, after line 7, to insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION"

"PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS"

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (c) (1) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended, the amount payable to a local educational agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, with respect to

the number of children determined under subsection (a) or (b) of section 3 thereof shall be computed on the same basis as was used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 3 of said law."

On page 22, after line 17, to insert:

"WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

"Salaries, expenses, and grants: For carrying out the act of July 26, 1954 (Public Law 530), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$1,250,000, of which \$1 million shall be for grants to the States in accordance with section 2 of such act: *Provided*, That a Conference Director may be appointed by the Secretary at a salary of \$15,000 per annum."

At the top of page 23, to insert:

"OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

"GRANTS TO STATES AND OTHER AGENCIES

"For grants to States and other agencies in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, \$6 million, of which \$1,500,000 is for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of said act; \$1,500,000 is for extension and improvement projects under section 3 of said act; and \$3 million is for special projects under section 4 of said act: *Provided*, That the amounts appropriated for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation under the heads 'Payments to States' in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955, shall be available, without regard to the limitations set forth therein, for the purposes of section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That the paragraphs under the head 'Office of Vocational Rehabilitation' in this act shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 9640 or S. 2759, 83d Congress."

On page 23, after line 18, to insert:

"TRAINING AND TRAINEESHIPS

"For grants for training and traineeships pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, and for carrying out the training functions provided for in section 7 of said act, \$1,831,000."

At the top of page 24, to insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' \$400,000, of which \$8,800 shall be transferred to the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel': *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for production, purchase, and distribution of educational films, is hereby repealed."

Under the subhead "Public Health Service—Grants for Hospital Construction," on page 24, line 17, after the word "expended," to strike out "\$15,700,000" and insert "\$35,000,000"; in line 20, after the word "centers," to strike out "\$5,225,000" and insert "\$10,000,000"; in line 21, after the word "impaired," to strike out "\$5,225,000" and insert "\$10,000,000"; in line 22, after the word "facilities," to strike out "\$2,625,000" and insert "\$10,000,000"; and in line 23, after the word "homes," to strike out "\$2,625,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

Under the subhead "Salaries and Expenses, Hospital Construction Services," on page 25, line 6, after the word "services," to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$300,000."

Under the subhead "Social Security Administration—Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," on page 25, after line 8, to strike out:

"None of the funds available to the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance shall be used to pay any costs, direct or indirect, of moving any group of employees of the Bureau from Baltimore, Md., to Washington, D. C."

On page 25, after line 13, to insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

"The amounts made available under this head for the fiscal year 1955 shall be available for the payment of special allowances to those employees of the Department whose headquarters are relocated from Baltimore, Md., to Washington, D. C., at \$9 per day after arrival at Washington, D. C., for 6 days for employees, plus \$4.50 per day additional for 6 days for each member of immediate families of employees."

At the top of page 26, to insert:

"For an additional amount for 'salaries and expenses,' \$6 million, to be derived by transfer from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, of which not more than \$59,300 may be transferred to 'Salaries and expenses, offices of field services' for expenses of activities relating to the old-age and survivors insurance program."

On page 26, after line 6, to insert:

"ADVANCES TO STATES, NEXT SUCCEEDING FISCAL YEAR

"For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, advances to States under section 221 (e) of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary from the above authorization may be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund."

On page 26, after line 13, to insert:

"The two immediately preceding paragraphs under the head 'Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance' in this act shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 9366 or similar legislation of the 83d Congress."

On page 26, after line 18, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

"For construction of an office building and appurtenant facilities for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, including equipment, acquisition of land (including donations thereof), and preparation of plans and specifications, \$22,290,000, to be derived from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and to remain available until expended."

On page 27, after line 2, to insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CHILDREN'S BUREAU

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau,' \$165,000."

On page 27, after line 5, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary,' \$75,000, of which \$52,000 shall be available only for administrative and operational studies."

On page 27, after line 10, to insert:

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

"For expenses necessary for the National Advisory Committee on Education and the conduct of studies of national concern in the field of education recommended by the Committee as authorized by the act of July 26, 1954 (Public Law 532), and studies of the educational problems of the Indian population, \$100,000."

On page 27, after line 17, to insert:

"CIVIL DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

"For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out functions delegated to it pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$1,800,000."

At the top of page 28, to insert:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Sec. 502. There shall be hereafter in the Department of Labor, in addition to the Assistant Secretaries now provided for by law, one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be subject in all respects to the provisions of the act of April 17, 1946 (60 Stat. 91), as amended (5 U. S. C. 611b), relating to Assistant Secretaries of Labor. Section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1950, as amended (64 Stat. 1263; 66 Stat. 121), is hereby repealed: *Provided*, That the present incumbent of the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary may be reassigned to an appropriate position in the Department without reduction in the rate of basic compensation."

On page 28, line 16, to change the chapter number from "V" to "VI."

Under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Forest Service," on page 28, after line 18, to insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' for national forest protection and management, \$375,000."

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' for forest research, \$515,000."

On page 29, after line 3, to insert:

"SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"WATERSHED PROTECTION

"For an additional amount for 'Watershed protection,' to remain available until expended, \$2,425,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Office of the Solicitor,' 1955: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this head shall be available for carrying out the purposes of the act of (Public Law , 83d Cong.): *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 6788, 83d Congress."

On page 29, after line 14, to insert:

"FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

"For an additional amount for 'Foreign Agricultural Service,' including not to exceed \$15,000 for representation allowances, \$1,500,000, of which \$1 million shall be derived from such appropriation or appropriations available to the Department of State as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may determine: *Provided*, That transfers shall be made under this authorization in lieu of any similar transfers which may be authorized under the Agricultural Act of 1954 (H. R. 9680, 83d Cong.): *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 9680, 83d Congress."

On page 30, after line 2, to insert:

"COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

"For an additional amount for 'Commodity Exchange Authority,' \$93,000: *Provided*, That \$39,000 of this appropriation shall be effective only upon enactment of legislation which would add 'coffee' under the definition of the word 'commodities' as defined in section 2 (a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1-17a); \$34,000 shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 6435, 83d Congress; and \$20,000 shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 2313, 83d Congress."

On page 30, after line 12, to insert:

"FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

"LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

"For loans under the act of August 28, 1937, as amended, \$3,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed the foregoing amount shall be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in the manner authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act,

1955: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon enactment into law of either H. R. 8386 or S. 3137, 83d Congress."

On page 30, after line 22, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

"For an additional amount for 'Office of the Solicitor,' \$54,000: *Provided*, That \$40,000 shall be effective only upon enactment into law of either H. R. 8386 or S. 3137, 83d Congress."

On page 31, line 3, to change the chapter number from "VI" to "VII."

Under the heading "Department of the Interior—Bureau of Indian Affairs—Construction," on page 31, line 15, after the word "Construction", to strike out "\$3,900,000" and insert "\$6,931,000"; in line 16, after the word "expended", to strike out the comma and "and the limitation under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for personal services is increased by '\$1,000,000'" and insert "*Provided*, That \$3,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available to provide financial assistance to public school districts for the construction and equipment of public school facilities for Navaho Indian children from reservation areas not included in such districts; and \$31,000 shall be for the payment of the excess value of land, water rights, and irrigation structures to be received by the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians of the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation in exchange for tribal lands of said tribe located in the State of Nevada."

On page 32, at the beginning of line 4, to insert "*Provided*, That title to the land to be acquired for said tribe described as southeast quarter of section 22, township 21 north, range 24 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian, containing 160 acres, more or less, and structures shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for said tribe."

On page 32, line 9, after the amendment just above stated, to insert: "*Provided further*, That the prohibition against the use of funds appropriated under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1955, for the acquisition of land or water rights within the State of Nevada, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations shall not apply to this transaction."

On page 32, line 14, after the amendment just above stated, to insert: "*Provided further*, That the limitation under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for personal services is increased by \$1,000,000."

On page 32, after line 17, to insert:

"RELOCATION OF THE YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE

"For necessary expenses of relocating the Yankton Sioux Tribe, South Dakota, in accordance with section 8 of Public Law No. 478, 83d Congress, to remain available until expended, \$106,500: *Provided*, That said amount shall be assessed against the costs of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River Development."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Reclamation", on page 33, after line 1, to insert:

"GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

"For an additional amount for 'General Investigations', \$500,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund."

Under the subhead "Construction and Rehabilitation", on page 33, line 7, after the word "rehabilitation" to strike out "\$1,707,000" and insert "\$8,120,000"; in line 8, after the word "expended" to insert "of which \$2,320,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund"; in line 12, after the word "by" to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$4,840,968", and in line 15, after the word "executed", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That \$375,000 of the unobligated funds

heretofore appropriated for the Missouri River Basin project shall be available for additional investigations on the Garrison diversion unit, including the Shesenne Farm and the Oakes Development tract in North Dakota, and for the White River and Willow Creek Dam in South Dakota."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Mines—Construction", on page 34, line 3, after the word "Construction", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$6,000,000."

On page 34, after line 14, to strike out:

"OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

"ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

"For an additional amount for 'Administration of Territories', \$47,000."

On page 34, after line 18, to insert:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Sec. 702. Limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services under appropriations in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 465, 83d Cong.), shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the act of December 21, 1944 (5 U. S. C. 611b-d)."

On page 35, after line 2, to insert:

"Sec. 703. The limitation for personal services under the heading 'Construction, Bonneville Power Administration', contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 465, 83d Cong.), is hereby increased from \$6,250,000 to \$7,450,000."

On page 35, after line 7, to insert:

"Sec. 704. Funds appropriated under the heading, 'Administration of Territories' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law No. 465, 83d Cong.) shall be available to carry out the provisions of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (Public Law No. 517, 83d Cong.)."

On page 35, line 14, to change the chapter number from "VII" to "VIII."

Under the heading "Independent Offices—Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—Salaries and Expenses," on page 36, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "\$497,835" and insert "\$753,150", and in line 7, after the word "by", to strike out "\$62,700" and insert "\$137,700."

Under the subhead "General Services Administration—Additional Court Facilities", on page 36, line 15, after the word "buildings", to strike out "\$2,820,600" and insert "\$2,970,600", and in line 16, after the numerals "1956", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for providing facilities at Flint, Michigan."

On page 36, after line 18, to insert:

"PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS, LEASE-PURCHASE CONTRACTS

"The unobligated balances of the funds made available by section 1 (a) of the act of June 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 257), the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, and the General Appropriation Act, 1951, for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of drawings and specifications for Federal public building projects outside the District of Columbia, as authorized by title I of the act of June 16, 1949 (63 Stat. 176), as amended, and by the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), as amended, shall be available also for expenses of preparation of drawings and specifications, by contract or otherwise, and administrative expenses, for carrying out the purposes of the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (Public Law 519, 83d Cong.), approved July 22, 1954."

Under the subhead "Expenses, General Supply Fund", on page 37, line 22, after the word "proceeds" to strike out "shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts" and insert "credited to the fund from which rental payments are made."

At the top of page 38, to insert:

"SURVEY OF GOVERNMENT RECORDS, RECORDS MANAGEMENT, AND DISPOSAL PRACTICES

"For necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$25,000 for administrative expenses, in connection with conducting surveys of Government records, and records creation, maintenance, management and disposal practices in Federal agencies, pursuant to sections 505 and 506 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, \$500,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of said act, the Administrator shall have final authority in all matters involving the conduct of surveys and the implementation of recommendations based on such surveys: *Provided further*, That the General Services Administration is authorized to procure services in accordance with section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That a detailed quarterly report on the progress of each survey conducted hereunder shall be made to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress."

At the top of page 39, to insert:

"HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

"OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', \$1 million; and the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for expenses of travel, is increased from '\$169,325' to '\$260,825': *Provided*, That the authority contained under this head in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (Public Law 357) for transfer of funds to this appropriation is continued through December 31, 1954, but additional amounts transferred pursuant to this extension shall not exceed \$250,000, including not to exceed \$25,000 for expenses of travel."

On page 39, after line 14, to insert:

"REIMBURSEMENT TO FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

"For reimbursing the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incident to investigation of matters in connection with programs authorized by the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1701), \$560,000."

On page 39, after line 19, to insert:

"RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS

"For advances to public agencies and for surveys to carry out the purposes of section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, \$5 million."

At the top of page 40, to insert:

"PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

"Public facility loans, payment to revolving fund: For payment to the revolving fund pursuant to section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act as amended (40 U. S. C. 459), \$18 million: *Provided*, That the provisions of the first proviso under the head 'Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses' in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 428) with respect to expenses of inspections and of providing representatives at project sites shall apply to projects or facilities financed by loans from the revolving fund hereby established, and the limitation on such nonadministrative expenses in said proviso is increased from '\$500,000' to '\$525,000'."

On page 40, after line 13, to insert:

"URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

"For grants to State, regional and metropolitan area planning bodies in accordance with the provisions of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, \$2,500,000."

On page 40, after line 17, to insert:

"PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Administrative expenses,' \$800,000."

On page 40, after line 21, to insert:

"CORPORATIONS

"Federal National Mortgage Association: The limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 428), shall be exclusive of expenses (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of obligations as authorized by title II of the Housing Act of 1954."

On page 41, after line 5, to insert:

"Office of the Administrator, public facility loans: Not to exceed \$210,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 459), shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U. S. C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States."

On page 41, after line 18, to insert:

"Federal Housing Administration: The amount made available under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 428), for administrative expenses, is increased from '\$5,150,000' to '\$6,500,000' and the limitation on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased from '\$175,000' to '\$355,000'; *Provided*, That the limitation under said head on the amount available for certain non-administrative expenses of said Administration is increased from '\$25,000,000' to '\$28,000,000'."

On page 42, after line 5, to insert:

"Public Housing Administration: The amount made available under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 428), for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out duties imposed by law, is increased from '\$6,950,000' to '\$7,750,000'; and the limitation under said head on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased from '\$500,000' to '\$580,000'."

On page 42, after line 13, to insert:

"NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

"LAND ACQUISITION, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK, PARKWAY, AND PLAYGROUND SYSTEM

"For an additional amount for 'Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system,' \$60,000, to remain available until expended, to be used for carrying out the provisions of section 1 (a) of the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended."

Under the subhead "National Science Foundation—International Geophysical Year," on page 43, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$2,500,000."

At the top of page 44, to insert:

"SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' \$350,000."

On page 45, line 1, to change the chapter number from "VIII" to "IX."

Under the heading "Military Construction—Department of Defense," on page 43, after line 13, to insert:

"FAMILY HOUSING

"For family housing authorized by the enactment into law of H. R. 9924, 83d Congress, not to exceed \$175 million to be made available to the respective military departments in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall not be used for family housing unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that (1) it is impracticable to construct family housing under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act, and (2) that adequate housing at reasonable rental rates is not available in the immediate vicinity of the military installation, and (3) it is impracticable to acquire suitable housing under other existing provisions of law."

Under the subhead "Department of the Army—Alaska Communications System, Construction," on page 46, line 10, after the word "the" to strike out "act of , 1954 (Public Law , H. R. 9242" and insert "act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534."

On page 46, after line 15, to insert:

"ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

"The Secretary of the Army may transfer not to exceed \$3 million, to the appropriation 'Army National Guard, 1955' for additional State National Guard civilian employees from any appropriation available to the Department of the Army when such transfers are determined by the Secretary of the Army to be in the national interest."

Under the subhead "Department of the Navy—Public Works, Navy," on page 47, line 6, after the word "the", to strike out "act of , 1954 (Public Law , H. R. 9242" and insert "act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534"; in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$5,000,000"; and line line 15, after "(34 U. S. C. 556)", to strike out "\$73,517,000" and insert "\$114,000,000."

Under the subhead "Department of the Air Force—Acquisition and Construction of Real Property," on page 48, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "act of , 1954 (Public Law , H. R. 9242" and insert "act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534"; and in line 7, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$484,080,000" and insert "\$796,000,000."

Under the subhead "General Provisions," on page 48, line 10, to change the section number from "802" to "902", in line 13, after the word "the" to strike out "act of 1954 (Public Law , H. R. 9242" and insert "act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534."

On page 48, line 21, to change the section number from "803" to "903."

On page 49, line 3, to change the section number from "804" to "904."

On page 49, line 11, to change the section number from "805" to "905."

On page 49, after line 18, to insert:

"Sec. 906. Subsection (b) of section 404 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 993; 49 U. S. C. 484 (b)) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: '*Provided*, That nothing in this or any other act shall prevent the carriage, storage, or handling of property free or at reduced rates for the Department of Defense, or the transportation of persons free or at reduced rates for the Department of Defense on a space available basis on scheduled service.'"

On page 50, after line 2, to insert:

"Sec. 907. (a) The Department of Defense is authorized to acquire by purchase, or by lease or otherwise for a period not to exceed 7 years, not to exceed six vessels capable of transporting, loading and unloading railroad rolling stock, on rails by the roll-on, roll-off method, as well as wheeled and tracked military equipment to be loaded and discharged under their own power."

"(b) Any appropriation of the Department of Defense shall be available for the purposes of this act."

On page 50, after line 11, to insert:

"Sec. 908. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey, subject to such terms, conditions, and restrictions as are required by this act and the public interest, to the Los Angeles City High School District of Los Angeles County, Calif., all right, title, and interest of the United States to the Birmingham General Hospital tract consisting of 117³¹/₁₀₀ acres of land, more or less, and all improvements thereon located at Van Nuys, Calif. In addition to other consideration required by this section for the conveyance authorized hereunder, such school district shall be required to pay to the Secretary of the Army the sum of \$500,000. Upon receipt by the Secretary of the Army such sum shall be credited to the appropriation, 'Military Construction, Army,' and shall be available for (1) the construction and other costs involved in moving to a suitable Government-owned site the buildings to be reconveyed to the Secretary under the provisions of this section, and (2) the construction of additional supporting facilities at such site as may be required for authorized defense construction."

On page 51, after line 6, to insert:

"In addition to other terms, conditions, and restrictions contained in the deed whereby the Birmingham General Hospital is conveyed to such school district, the school district shall agree, as a part of the consideration for the conveyance, (1) to reconvey to the Secretary of the Army, immediately upon acceptance of the deed, and without consideration, title to the buildings which are located at the Birmingham General Hospital and which are occupied by troops on the date of enactment of this act, and (2) to permit such buildings to remain in place for continued occupancy by troops until substitute facilities are constructed by the Secretary of the Army, and such buildings are removed."

On page 51, after line 18, to insert:

"CHAPTER X

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

"Rivers and harbors and flood control

"Construction, General

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general,' \$8,275,000 to remain available until expended, of which \$1,600,000 shall be available for advanced engineering and design by the Corps of Engineers for projects which have been authorized for development with participation by State, local government or private groups and for authorized projects which are under consideration for participation by such agencies: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2 million of unexpended funds appropriated for the current or any previous fiscal year to the Department of the Army for Construction, General, Rivers and Harbors, shall be available until expended for use on such authorized river and harbor projects as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to the national defense program."

On page 52, after line 12, to insert:

"For contribution to the city of Muskogee, toward the construction of a water supply pipeline from the existing city water supply intake on the Grand River near its junction with the Arkansas River to Fort Gibson Dam, in settlement for all damages to the water supply of the city of Muskogee, on account of the construction and operation of Fort Gibson Reservoir, \$200,000 out of funds previously appropriated."

On page 52, after line 19, to insert:

"The project for bank protection on the Missouri River from Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, authorized by the act approved August 18, 1941, and modified and extended upstream to include Miners Bend

and vicinity, South Dakota and Nebraska, by the act of June 30, 1948, is hereby further modified to include dredging McCook Lake at an estimated Federal cost of not to exceed \$500,000."

On page 53, after line 2, to insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

"For an additional amount for 'Operation and maintenance, general', \$840,000 to remain available until expended."

On page 53, after line 6, to insert:

"FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

"For an additional amount for 'Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries', \$1,000,000 to remain available until expended."

On page 53, line 11, to change the chapter number from "IX" to "XI."

Under the heading "Emergency Programs and Activities, Department of State—Government in Occupied Areas," on page 55, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$50,000"; and in line 7, after (50 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b)), to strike out "\$14,000,000" and insert "\$14,500,000."

Under the subhead "Funds Appropriated to the President," on page 56, after line 21, to insert:

"EMERGENCY FUND FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

"For expenses necessary to enable the President to take such measures as he deems appropriate to meet extraordinary or unusual circumstances arising in the international affairs of the Government, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, for use in the President's discretion and without regard to such provisions of law as he may specify: *Provided*, That the President shall transmit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, not less often than quarterly, a full report of expenditures under this appropriation."

Under the subhead "Refugee Relief," on page 57, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$80,000" and insert "\$174,000"; in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$1,500,000"; in line 24, after the word "loans", to strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$9,025,000", and on page 58, line 3, after the word "allocated", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That the entire amount herein appropriated may, if found necessary by the Bureau of the Budget for effective administration of the program, be apportioned for use during the first 9 months of the fiscal year."

On page 58, after line 7, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF TANKERS

"For construction of tankers as authorized by the act of 1954, Public Law , \$37,500,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be transferred to such appropriation as the President may designate."

Under the subhead "Federal Civil Defense Administration—Operations", on page 62, line 22, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "\$8,525,000" and insert "\$11,000,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That not to exceed \$350,000 of the unobligated balance of the 1954 appropriation for this purpose shall remain available until June 30, 1955."

Under the subhead "Federal Contributions", on page 63, line 5, after the word "funds", to strike out "\$10,500,000" and insert "\$14,750,000."

Under the subhead "Emergency Supplies and Equipment", on page 63, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$32,100,000."

Under the subhead "Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission", on page 63, line 23, after the word "compensation", to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles; and entertainment; \$170,000."

On page 66, line 4, to change the chapter number from "X" to "XII."

Under the heading "Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments", on page 66, line 12, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Documents Nos. 144 and 146 and"; and in line 14, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$9,296,561" and insert "\$11,472,202."

On page 67, line 3, to change the chapter number from "XI" to "XIII."

Under the heading "General Provisions—Departments, Agencies, and Corporations", on page 67, line 6, to change the section number from "1101" to "1301"; and in line 13, after the word "acts", to insert "except cars for Chiefs of Missions abroad."

On page 67, line 16, to change the section number from "1102" to "1302."

On page 68, line 22, to change the section number from "1103" to "1303."

On page 69, line 12, to change the section number from "1104" to "1304."

On page 69, line 17, to change the section number from "1105" to "1305."

On page 70, line 1, to change the section number from "1106" to "1306."

On page 70, line 16, to change the section number from "1107" to "1307."

On page 70, line 23, to change the section number from "1108" to "1308."

On page 71, line 7, to change the section number from "1109" to "1309."

On page 71, line 24, to change the section number from "1110" to "1310."

On page 73, beginning on line 1, strike out the following:

"Sec. 1111. (a) After the date of enactment hereof no amount shall be recorded as an obligation of the Government of the United States unless it is supported by documentary evidence of—

"(1) a binding agreement in writing between the parties thereto, in a manner and form and for a purpose authorized by law, executed before the expiration of the period of availability for obligation of the appropriation or fund concerned for specific goods to be delivered, real property to be purchased or leased, or work or services to be performed; or

"(2) a valid loan agreement, showing the amount of the loan to be made and the terms of repayment thereof; or

"(3) an order required by law to be placed with a Government agency; or

"(4) an order issued pursuant to a law authorizing purchases without advertising when necessitated by public exigency or for perishable subsistence supplies or within specific monetary limitations; or

"(5) a grant or subsidy payable (1) from appropriations made for payment of or contributions toward, sums required to be paid in specific amounts fixed by law or in accord with formulae prescribed by law, or (2) pursuant to agreement authorized by, or plans approved in accord with and authorized by, law; or

"(6) a liability which may result from pending litigation brought under authority of law; or

"(7) employment or services of persons or expenses of travel in accord with law, and services performed by public utilities; or

"(8) any other legal liability of the United States against an appropriation or fund legally available therefor."

"(b) Not later than September 30 of each year, the head of each Federal agency shall certify, as to each appropriation or fund under the control of such agency, the amount thereof remaining obligated but unexpended and the amount thereof remaining unobligated on June 30 of such year and copies of such certification shall be forwarded by him to the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to the Comptroller General of the United States, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the duty of

making certifications as required by this subsection shall not be delegated: *Provided*, That such certification for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, shall be made not later than October 31, 1954, and shall include only such obligations as could have been recorded under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof.

"(c) Each certification made pursuant to subsection (b) shall be supported by records evidencing the amounts which are certified therein as having been obligated and such records shall be retained in the agency in such form as to facilitate audit and reconciliation for such period as may be necessary for such purposes.

"(d) No appropriation or fund which is limited for obligation purposes to a definite period of time shall be available for expenditure after the expiration of such period except for liquidation of amounts obligated in accord with subsection (a) hereof; but no such appropriation or fund shall remain available for expenditure for any period beyond that otherwise authorized by law.

"(e) Any statement of obligation of funds furnished by any agency of the Government to the Congress or any committee thereof shall include only such amounts as may be valid obligations as defined in subsection (a) hereof."

On page 75, line 20, to change the section number from "1112" to "1311."

On page 77, after line 3, to insert:

"Sec. 1312. The appropriations, authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this act shall be available from July 1, 1954, for the purposes provided in such appropriations, authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1954, and the date of enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof and the terms of Public Law 475, 83d Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was interested in what the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] stated in relation to the appropriation for the Air Force. Is it not a fact that the appropriation in this bill is not the military appropriation for the Air Force, but merely an appropriation for construction work so far as the military is concerned?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not suggest otherwise.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but I think the RECORD ought to be very clear on that matter.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that other items for construction in relation to the other services are also included in this bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that the authorizations for these items were passed within the past 2 or 3 weeks?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. To keep the RECORD straight, because I do not want to make an erroneous statement, my information is that the authorization has not as yet passed, but it is still in conference. I was defending the Appropriations Committee with respect to recommending appropriations on the basis of authorizations which had not even been passed.

If the Air Force wishes to expand to 137 wings, they will have to have additional appropriations. They will have to have the money. No authorization bill has been passed and sent to the President.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thought it had been passed.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, it is in conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. The housing bill has passed, but the military housing construction bill has not passed.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is in conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I meant to say. The fact is that we are considering a deficiency bill, which I do not like, and which the chairman does not like, when all the authorization bills have not passed as yet.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Much of this bill is not in the nature of a deficiency; it is a supplemental bill covering items which were authorized during the current session.

Mr. BRIDGES. A great many of the items in this bill are made necessary entirely because of new legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. They are parts of the program of the administration, and this is the first appropriation bill which could provide for them.

Mr. FERGUSON. So they were not and could not be anticipated by the Bureau of the Budget in the previous appropriation bills because they had not been authorized.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. The Bureau of the Budget spelled them out, and indicated that when and if they were authorized they would be recommended.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator knows that the Bureau of the Budget makes up the budget in October. If we keep talking on this bill as long as we have talked on some other bills, we will probably be here in October, and the Bureau will be making up the budget for next year. In October the Budget Bureau decides upon its recommendations for the appropriation bills for the next fiscal year. Is that not correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to submit an amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Was the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Hampshire, as modified, accepted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the bill open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And for elimination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can make any motion he desires to strike out or further amend.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota. However, the Senator from New Mexico has an amendment which he is ready to offer.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota would like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire with respect to a portion of the committee report accompanying this bill. The committee report embraces a table of projects for the construction by application of previously appropriated funds. In that table I do not see one of the items which was requested by the Military Department but which had not been enacted into law prior to the time the compilation was made. I have reference to the item for the Black Hills Ordnance Depot, with which the Senator is familiar.

Since that is merely a part of the committee report and requires agreement with the House committee, I am wondering if the Senator could assure me that in the conference with the House this ordnance depot item will be taken into consideration in an effort to secure concurrence in the application of previously appropriated funds consistent with the authorization which has since been approved by the House.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire understands that item, and while this is not in the bill and is not an item mentioned in the report on page 46—

Mr. CASE. The general program is based on page 46.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire would be glad to add in the report and present to the conference the Black Hills Ordnance Depot.

Mr. CASE. That is mentioned in the hearings at page 1005.

Mr. BRIDGES. I remember that it is. This is not new funds. This is merely putting it in the program for previously appropriated funds, in line with a series of other programs which we have outlined on page 46 of the report.

Mr. CASE. It is consistent with the request of the Army as shown at page 1005 of the hearings.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire is aware of that and believes that we can include it in the report.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The appropriation item under the heading "General Services Administration, hospital facilities in the District of Columbia" contained in the act approved July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 637), as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the word "asylum" at the end of the first proviso, as amended, and before the colon, the phrase "and Georgetown University Hospital."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I understand the amendment will not increase the amount. It will merely add Georgetown University Hospital, as a

facility in the District of Columbia, to the list of institutions which might apply and operate under the overall act.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There are now five institutions in the District of Columbia that avail themselves of the provisions of the act. It is desired to get Georgetown University Hospital on the list. No extra money is required.

Mr. BRIDGES. As I understand it, the amendment merely puts Georgetown Hospital on the same basis as the other hospitals within the District of Columbia.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire has no objection to that. He thinks the hospital institutions of the District of Columbia, certainly the outstanding ones, should be treated on a similar basis, and he has no objection to taking the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I sent forward an amendment—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the chairman of the committee have the power to farm out the time so that he can determine which amendment can be brought up and which cannot?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has no such power.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Cannot all Senators seek recognition directly from the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, should not the Senator from Maryland have sought recognition from the Chair, rather than having the Senator from New Hampshire yield to him?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Maryland advises the Senator from Illinois that he sought recognition on four different occasions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I say to the Senator from Maryland that he should have sought recognition from the Presiding Officer rather than to have the Senator from New Hampshire yield to him.

Mr. BUTLER. I would rather not get into the protocol of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maryland. The clerk will state the amendment offered by him.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, after line 8, it is proposed to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE MARITIME ACTIVITIES

Repair of reserve fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authorization)

For the payment of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the "Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954," \$18 million to remain available until December 31, 1956: *Provided*, That advances may be made from this appropriation to "Salaries and expenses, maritime activities," for administrative expenses (not to exceed \$500,000), and for reserve fleet expenses (in such amounts as may be required), and such

advances shall be in addition to amounts otherwise made available for such expenses: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law during the 83d Congress of S. 3546.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on July 8 the Senate passed an authorization bill involving \$45 million for the purpose of repairing and modernizing 205 vessels in the reserve or laid-up fleet. These vessels would be designated by the Department of Commerce and the Department of Defense as being needful in the event of emergency. Some will be converted into naval auxiliaries, others which would be needed immediately in the event of an emergency will be repaired and made ready to sail within days rather than within months after the happening of that emergency.

The authorization bill then went to the House of Representatives and was reduced by the House from \$45 million to \$25 million. The House action was predicated upon the fact that the authorization in its entirety was not needed over the balance of this year.

After looking into the matter, the committee in conference today acceded to the House amendment, and the amount in the bill is now \$25 million. The appropriation to carry out the action of the Senate on July 8 would be provided by my amendment.

Mr. President, a summary of the estimated amount of money or \$25 million is as follows:

Repair of 90 of these vessels will cost an estimated \$15,905,000; the repair and conversion of 15 of these vessels will cost approximately \$5,600,000, or a total of \$21,505,000; incidental costs will involve \$2,100,000; reserve fleet expenses approximately \$900,000; administrative expenses, \$500,000; making a total of about \$25 million.

This money is needed now if the program is to be a success. The ships must be removed from mothballs immediately and started on their way to the yards. A number of immediate short-term contracts will be necessary, and payments will be required under the contracts. I therefore ask that the chairman of the committee accept the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is an item on which there has been some discussion before. However, it never came to the Committee on Appropriations for hearings or examination. It arrived yesterday after the bill had been reported by the committee to the Senate. The explanation given to the Senator from New Hampshire and to the other members of the Committee on Appropriations, as to the reason for its not coming up before, was that only as of today the conferees agreed on the authorization bill.

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Since there had been no agreement before, the Bureau of the Budget had failed to send up an estimate, and the President had not submitted the program for the same reason.

Mr. BUTLER. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire, when I talked to the President recently concerning this program he expressed the opinion that it was a most essential item; something

which should be undertaken in the interest of national defense.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that that was in general the information conveyed to the Senator from New Hampshire. However, I think the passage of the legislation is important to the country, particularly from the standpoint of our national defense. It is also a fact that the conferees have come to agreement, even though the conference report has not yet been agreed to by either House. I assume it will be agreed to, because the conferees unanimously agreed to the report. The Senator from New Hampshire has had no opportunity to contact the members of his committee. However, on my own responsibility I would be willing to take the amendment to conference.

The Senator from New Hampshire would not feel, without testimony, and so forth, that he could accept the full amount of \$25 million. However, the Senator from New Hampshire would be willing to take enough money to start operating the program, which has been enacted by Congress and recommended by the President, although he would not be willing to take the whole amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is only the first supplemental appropriation bill. Undoubtedly there will be additional supplemental appropriation bills during the coming year. Why should we appropriate \$25 million at the last minute when the committee has not been able to take testimony or to appraise the matter? Why cannot this item be left over until January, when there will certainly be a second supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I would say to the Senator from Illinois that the purpose of the bill stands very high in the estimation of the President of the United States, from the standpoint of national defense, and he feels that these vessels, which would be vitally needed in the event of war, should now be removed from mothballs and repaired and converted immediately. He also feels that, in addition to the usefulness of the ships themselves in the event of an emergency, we must also necessarily maintain, for our defense and protection, certain minimum skilled labor in our ship repair yards.

The Senator can point his finger all he wants, to attempt to indicate that he has now hit the jackpot, but let me tell him that he has not. These ships are essential to our national defense. Our shipbuilding and ship repair yards are likewise essential to our national defense in the event of an emergency, and must be kept in existence.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Maryland has pinpointed the purpose of the amendment, which is to keep the shipyards busy. Although that may be a very estimable purpose, it is obviously in the nature of a subsidy. Perhaps we should do it. It may well be that we should, but I am a

little suspicious about ship construction and ship repair and ship operation subsidies, which come to Congress year after year under the guidance of big lobbies. I am a little suspicious, and therefore I believe we should scrutinize very carefully items of that kind before we grant appropriations.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am not normally disposed to cut the Senator from Illinois off, even though I have the floor, but I should like to emphasize that this program was passed by the Senate by a very large vote. It had been previously unanimously approved by our committee because it was considered to be essential to the national defense of our country. If the Senator wants to stand astride in opposition to the program, he may do so. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would suggest that the matter could be held off until the next supplemental appropriation bill comes along.

Mr. BUTLER. I suggest that the Senate adopt the amendment in the interest of national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. Without objection—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to register my objection.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to say in connection with the amendment that one of the questions in which the Senator from New Hampshire was interested was whether or not awards of contracts could be made without competitive bidding. The Senator from New Hampshire felt that competitive bidding was essential in connection with any item of this type.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I can answer that question. The conference committee has agreed to strike out the objectionable language to which the Senator is addressing himself.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it is a very necessary amendment. If the chairman of the committee takes the amendment to conference, the RECORD ought to be clear that the money will not be available until the authorization bill is signed by the President. It should be understood that the money will be available when the authorization bill is passed.

Mr. BUTLER. The amendment provides further that "this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 3546, the authorization bill, into law during the 83d Congress."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Therefore we are protected in that respect.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire will say to the Senator from Maryland that he would not be willing to assume the responsibility for his committee by accepting the full amount of the amendment without first taking testimony in connection with the item. The Senator from New Hampshire does feel that it is essential that

the work shall proceed, now that the authorization has been agreed upon in conference between the two Houses. Therefore, the Senator from New Hampshire would be willing to accept the amendment providing \$18 million or \$19 million, which, according to the staff, certainly should be sufficient to permit the awarding of initial contracts, so as to start construction. Then requests can be made for additional funds either in the regular appropriation bill or in a supplemental appropriation bill, when a full justification can be made. I would accept \$18 million on that basis.

Mr. BUTLER. I will accede to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire, because I strongly believe this program should be put into effect immediately, for two reasons: First, we need these ships very badly; and secondly, we must keep a nucleus of skilled labor intact and keep the yards intact, all of which, in my opinion, will be closed by next January if this is not done.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator from Maryland will agree that what the chairman has suggested will be enough to get this started.

Mr. BUTLER. I do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We will see what we can do with that.

Mr. BUTLER. I accede to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, and I hope the Senator from Illinois will go along with us on it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I press my objection, but I am merely one Member of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland modify his amendment?

Mr. BUTLER. I modify my amendment in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire send the modification to the desk so that the clerk may read it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not have it in writing. I would change the figure \$25 million to \$18 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, line 5, it is proposed to strike out \$753,150 and insert in lieu thereof \$497,835.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I speak on the merits of that amendment; I wish to address myself to some general observations on this supplemental appropriations bill, and would like to have the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire. I respectfully suggest that he rest himself by sitting down while I do so.

Mr. President, the Senate committee's recommendations for planning funds for the John Day, Green Peter, and Cougar projects are very gratifying to me, as I am sure they are to the two Sena-

tors from Washington and the two Senators from Montana who have cooperated with me, as I have cooperated with them in our attempt to obtain some planning funds for some of our Northwest projects. I have been urging such action for many months.

At the outset of this session of Congress I advocated an aggressive program of public works in the Pacific Northwest to counteract the serious economic slump and to meet the electric power needs in the area. On January 18, in a Senate speech, I urged that money be made available for John Day Dam and other projects.

In March, in a statement to the Appropriations Committee, I recommended funds for many needed projects in Oregon and stressed the special merits of the John Day, Green Peter, and Cougar projects.

In April Senators MAGNUSON, JACKSON, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, and I submitted an amendment to the civil functions appropriations bill so as to add, among other things, \$700,000 in planning funds for the John Day project.

Appropriation of funds for this multipurpose dam is of particular importance because some 2 to 3 years of final planning are needed before the project can be brought to the construction stage.

The Appropriations Committee and the Senate adopted a provision for \$500,000 for this purpose. Unfortunately that amount was eliminated in conference.

Senators MAGNUSON, JACKSON, and I protested that action. And we renewed our efforts for planning funds when consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill was begun. On the very first day of hearings, I urged the committee to provide \$1,500,000 for John Day planning for an accelerated program. Senators MAGNUSON, JACKSON, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, and I submitted an amendment for that purpose.

The committee has recommended \$700,000. While I would prefer that an accelerated program be followed, this committee action is a decided improvement over its original action and that of the Senate.

It would be undesirable and unwise to use this higher figure only for bargaining purposes in conference. I wish to stress this in my comment, particularly for the benefit of the chairman of the committee. The Army engineers have advised me—and I have made this material available to the committee and to the Senate—that \$700,000 represents the funds needed to do a full year's work. This should remain the minimum amount below which the Senate will not go. I sincerely hope the Senator from New Hampshire, in whom I have great confidence, as he knows, will hold firm in conference for the \$700,000 figure and will not consider it a figure on the basis of which any compromise can be made, particularly in view of the fact that earlier this year the \$500,000 figure for John Day planning was stricken out in conference. It was the only figure for planning that was presented to the conference and stricken out.

I certainly hope that this time the figure will be considered an absolute es-

sential on the part of Senate conferees, and that we will not be confronted again, when the bill returns from conference, with the striking out of this figure. There is no question about the fact that, on the basis of the merits, the \$700,000 for a full year's work by the Army engineers in planning for the dam, irrespective of who finally builds the electric generating features of the dam, is a figure which is needed in the interest of the most economical use of the money by the Army engineers.

As I have made clear to the Committee on Appropriations, that is the report made by the Army engineers to me, and there is no question that this figure has the approval of the Army engineers.

It would be undesirable and unwise to use this higher figure only for bargaining purposes in conference. The Army engineers have advised me—and I have made this material available to the committee and to the Senate—that \$700,000 represents the funds needed to do a full year's work. This should remain the minimum amount below which the Senate will not go.

In similar fashion, the Green Peter and Cougar projects require a considerable amount of planning and project design before they would be ready for construction. Their flood-control features are imperatively needed in the Willamette River Basin. Power-generating facilities should be added to their plans and built when the basic projects are constructed. If the omnibus rivers and harbors bill is passed this year, that needed modification will be provided.

This is what I wish to direct to the attention of the chairman of the committee:

Both the committee report and the bill include funds for these projects along with those "which have been authorized for development with participation by State, local government, or private groups and for authorized projects which are under consideration for participation by such agencies."

It should be stressed that John Day, Green Peter, and Cougar are presently authorized as wholly Federal projects. So-called partnership proposals for them are at various stages of consideration. It is quite obvious that the necessary preliminary work can be accomplished for these important multipurpose dams without modifying the existing plans for them as Federal projects on a hurry-up basis. Any such proposed modifications require careful and deliberate study.

I wish to make it very clear that irrespective of what the committee may provide by way of language in the report, the language does not make them partnership projects. Approval for the partnership project, if it is to be approved, still awaits the action of the Senate. I wish to make it very clear that it is the appropriation which is controlling, and the provision for the planning is based upon the only authorization which heretofore has been approved by Congress, namely, by way of authorization for Federal projects, and not for partnership projects.

I wish to say a word about Yaquina Bay Harbor, Oreg.

It is also gratifying that the Appropriations Committee has recommended a supplemental appropriation of \$600,000 for repairs to the north jetty at Yaquina Bay Harbor, Oreg. This project is extremely important and the repair work is long overdue. For several months I have been in communication with residents of the Yaquina Bay area and they have described in detail the impediments to shipping resulting from sand and silt that is washed into the main ship channel from the deteriorated jetty. A great deal of shipping from ports on Yaquina Bay is connected with Government purchases for defense purposes. Repair of the jetty will be of tremendous benefit to the economy of the area.

I sincerely hope that not only will the amount provided pass the Senate in this bill, but that the committee will stand firm on the amount in conference.

Now a word in regard to Priest Rapids, and planning funds therefor.

The bill as reported would provide \$350,000 for planning funds for this project. Within the past few weeks a modification of the Priest Rapids authorization was enacted to provide for construction of the project wholly with funds to be raised privately by the Grant County and associated PUD's or alternate public agencies. Other non-reimbursable features might be added by the Federal Government at some future time.

I opposed the Priest Rapids bill because it would, in my judgment, cause delay and disruption to the plan for comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin. In the debate, I pointed out that there was no provision for effective power integration and public body preference. It was also noted that the possibilities for delay were manifold. It was my prediction that the PUD's would probably not succeed in making the necessary arrangements for constructing the dam and that there was a strong possibility that the vast quantities of electric power from the project would go to the benefit of private utilities, if we began to depart from the idea of having this a Federal project, built with Federal funds.

In just a few short weeks these unfortunate possibilities have increased.

When the bill was passed only the public utility district license application had been filed with the Federal Power Commission. Since, the Washington State Power Commission has filed an application.

It is interesting that under Washington State law the public utility districts must provide preference in sales to public bodies, but the State power commission is not required to do so. Public utility district contracts for power sales to private utilities are limited to 3 years. The State commission is not subject to a similar limitation.

This new filing will cause considerable delay. It will cause considerable controversy in the State of Washington and, in my judgment, considerable confusion also. The end result will be a further delay in the building of the dam.

If the State commission is successful, the private utilities will move closer to appropriating the benefits of this great power producer. I wish to make it very clear—and I want the two Senators from Washington to understand it—that I am in favor of appropriating funds for the Army engineers' planning on the project. This project should be returned to the status of a Federal multipurpose dam; and Federal efforts, such as this, to ready it for construction are all to the good. The money for planning by the engineers will be needed, no matter who builds the generating features of the dam. The planning will have to be done, even under the Priest Rapids bill that has been passed, by the Army engineers.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of the \$350,000 for the purpose of planning by the Army engineers. I respectfully urge the chairman of the committee to stand firm in conference, to see to it that the \$350,000 is retained in the bill when it comes from conference.

But again I issue the warning which I first issued during the debate on the Priest Rapids bill. We see already that forces are at work in the State of Washington, which I fear will succeed in not having the public utility district build the dam, but to have the State of Washington Water Power Commission build the dam or sponsor the dam, which means that behind the power commission the private utilities will get control of the dam, because that is the record of the State Commission in Washington.

The Public Works Committee has approved additional authorization of this project in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill reported last week.

This project has been described by some as a partnership project because provision is made for local expenditures on power facilities. However, it should be clear, as the House report—No. 2247 on H. R. 9859—indicates, that the Army engineers report:

(a) That the provision of hydroelectric power does not meet current criteria and should not be carried out at this time by the Federal Government.

These power facilities are not economic by Federal standards and local participation in that aspect of the project would not amount to handing over a proper Federal function.

Now a word with respect to the Coosa River project, in Alabama, which is covered in the bill. The appropriation bill, as reported, provides \$100,000 for Coosa River, Ala., planning. This is another so-called partnership project which I oppose. It should be explained what reimbursement the United States will receive.

As the record of the Committee on Public Works clearly shows, I opposed the Coosa River bill when it was before the Public Works Committee. The only reason that I am not on record as opposing it on the floor of the Senate is for reasons previously stated in a speech I made on the floor of the Senate. Illness in my family made it impossible for me to be on the floor of the Senate at the time the bill was being considered in the Senate. But had I been here, my

objections to it would have been the same as my objections expressed in the Public Works Committee, where I voted against the bill.

Mr. President, this Coosa River, Ala., project is another of the so-called partnership projects which I am opposed to. It should be explained what reimbursement the United States will receive under this bill.

This bill is exceptionally interesting in that the so-called partnership program is being undertaken at the very outset with Federal funds. It has yet to be demonstrated when the partners will begin to carry some—let alone a fair share—of the financial burden.

I have made these statements on the bill, Mr. President, because I do not want this Record ever to contain the slightest misunderstanding as to the position of the Senator from Oregon with regard to the development of the power resources of this country by the Federal Government.

In my judgment, except, as I have previously said, in those specific cases where a site is one which calls for the building of a low-head dam for generating purposes and not for multiple purposes, there should be Federal development. I think the multipurpose dam sites in this country should be developed by the Federal Government, and not on a so-called partnership basis.

However, where the site is particularly adaptable to the building of a private utility low-head dam, the private utilities can count on me for support.

I now turn to my amendment, which goes to the section of the bill on page 36, line 5, in regard to the Hoover Commission task force. It is proposed to increase the amount approved by the House from \$497,835 to \$753,150.

I think we should not increase the House figure. My amendment proposes to reduce the figure recommended by the Senate committee to the figure approved by the House for the reasons which I shall set out.

I regret, Mr. President, that this will be a speech of some length, but in my judgment in this innocent-looking little section of this bill we are dealing with a matter of great public concern to this country. We are dealing with a great division of opinion in the Senate as to what public policy should be in the whole field of electric power.

(At this point Mr. MORSE yielded for action on amendments, which appear at the conclusion of Mr. MORSE's speech.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall return to my amendment, and I shall not yield further.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the figure "\$753,150" and substitute in lieu thereof the figure "\$497,835."

PRIVATE UTILITY BIAS OF HOOVER COMMISSION TASK FORCE

Mr. MORSE. I shall discuss this amendment under the title of "Private Utility Bias of Hoover Commission Task Force."

The supplemental appropriation bill contains provisions for substantial additional funds for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—the Hoover Commission.

As the bill passed the House, there was provision for \$497,835 for salaries and expenses. The Senate committee recommends that these amounts be increased to \$753,150.

The committee report makes no justification for this amount beyond the statement that it is the amount requested in House Document No. 440, plus \$200,000 "to provide funds for additional duties assigned to the Commission."

Certainly the Commission's most publicized operation and an area of great activity has been Federal power policy.

It has been on the road for months, ostensibly taking testimony from local citizens.

At each stop there has been the same pattern. Private utility spokesmen have testified first with generous allotments of time. Co-op, PUD, municipal system, farm, labor, and small-business groups have been hurried through in the closing hours of sessions. The task force members have not hesitated to argue with public power yardstick advocates.

In Portland, Oreg., their bias was so obvious that even the Oregonian editorialized on the obvious private-utility bias of the task force.

It is pertinent to trace the origins of the group and the background of its membership and expected policy recommendations.

The electric-power policy which the administration is following has been carefully blueprinted and publicly advocated. There should be no confusion or fog about it. It is a liquidation policy. Its author stated:

The objective of the whole proceeding should be to get the Federal Government out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible.

In the face of this flat pronouncement about the objective, there have been continuing efforts to mislead the people. As the administration surrenders power projects like Hells Canyon, Priest Rapids—the best sites—to the private interests, it generally announces that planning is going to start on a big project like giant Libby Dam—projects which are so far out in the future they cannot possibly be started during the present administration.

No one should be misled. There is no intention of adding any new power facilities. The Federal Government is to be liquidated out of the power field entirely if it can be done, and that includes the projects now existing, as well as the great hydro and atomic projects which might be built in the future.

"EISENHOWER" POWER-GIVEAWAY POLICY

Because every citizen should be advised of the real objective of real administration's power policy—the "Eisenhower" power policy—I shall go into it in some detail and point out how it has been carefully followed during the first 18 months of the Cadillac crusade.

The "Eisenhower" power policy was enunciated by Ex-President Hoover almost exactly a year ago, on April 11, 1953, in an address to the diamond jubilee of the Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland, Ohio. The address was broadcast nationally and received considerable attention. But it was not then realized that Mr. Hoover was returning to power in the Federal Government. His program was then regarded as the viewpoint of the private utility interests. Only as administration policy has unfolded, and Mr. Hoover was brought into a high policymaking position in the new administration, has it become clear that his Cleveland speech was an enunciation of what the "Eisenhower" team was planning to do in the electric-power field.

Mr. Hoover preceded his statement of policy at Cleveland with the usual private utility slogans. Mr. Hoover said:

In the field of Federal electric power we have an example of 20 years of creeping socialism with a demonstration of its results.

The highly critical report made by the first Hoover Commission's staff of accountants and engineers amply illuminated the results of this Socialist invasion, Mr. Hoover said. He did not detail those findings. Instead, the ex-President then indulged in a little more of the sort of labeling which the electric companies' advertising program had previously recommended in a confidential report to power company executives. ECAP in 1949 advised private power companies to tie the Socialist tag on Federal power policy. Four years later, Mr. Hoover said:

Before I go into more detail I wish to say something as to what the American way of freemen really is.

The Socialists, with their ideas imported from Europe, totally misconstrue the unique structure of American life. They envisage it in terms of European societies * * *

Tonight I shall appraise the aspects of creeping socialism in the electric power industry by the Federal Government only.

For the benefit of those who are interested, this was before President Eisenhower tied the "creeping socialism" label on the TVA.

After 15 or 20 minutes of putting the label on public power, Mr. Hoover came to his proposed remedy. I shall read that portion of his text in full for it constitutes the blueprint of the power policy being followed today. I now quote Mr. Hoover:

However, I do not believe in criticism without remedies.

Over 20 years ago I recommended to Congress the transformation of an ex officio commission into a full Federal Power Commission with regulations that had teeth in them.

The purpose was to control the oppressive empires then growing in the private electric utilities. The transformation was made but without the teeth. My successor set up the Securities Exchange Commission to do this de-empiring. Now, however, it is the Federal Government itself that urgently needs the same de-empiring.

The first steps should be:

1. The Congress should cease to make appropriations for more steam plants or hydroelectric plants solely for power. If they are justified, private enterprise will build them and pay taxes on them.

2. The Congress should follow the precedent of the Colorado (Boulder Dam) project and make no more appropriations for new multiple-purpose projects unless the electric power is first leased on terms, the standards of which I shall describe in a moment.

3. The Congress should, jointly, with the President set up a temporary Commission on reorganization of this whole Federal venture, with resources to employ technical assistance.

(a) This Commission should investigate and recommend proper methods of accounting and a revision of the division of Federal investment in these projects between electric power and other purposes, and recommend proper practices for the future;

(b) The Commission should report on the actual cost of, and the prospective returns from, each of these major enterprises;

(c) The Commission should formulate the methods and standard terms for leasing generating plants, transmission lines, and the electrical energy to private enterprise or to the municipalities or to the States or to regional authorities that may be set up and managed by the States. These standard terms should provide for payment of interest and amortization of the Federal investment, the refunding of arrears in these items and also contributions in lieu of taxes. The latter would not need apply in the cases of private enterprise as they pay their own taxes.

(d) The Commission should develop methods by which non-Federal agencies can share cooperatively in the cost of future capital outlays on the electrical part of multiple-purpose dams.

Some of these projects could be disposed of so as to return these standard terms to the Federal Government. Others, due to excessive cost, may need concessions, and the Federal Government would need to cut its losses.

Others of them, pending disposal, will need to continue to be operated by the Federal Government. In these cases the Commission should recommend what rates they should charge their customers so as to make standard returns. They should recommend methods to compel such payments to the Federal Treasury instead of their diversion to other purposes. Such action would test the value of these enterprises and, in some cases, indicate what losses may need to be cut.

The objective of the whole proceeding should be to get the Federal Government out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible.

That was the blue print. That constitutes the Eisenhower-Hoover power policy. Mr. Hoover closed his address with another of the sort of characterizations approved by the electric companies' publicity men. He said:

Above all, we should rescue freemen from this variety of creeping socialism. The American people have fought off socialized medicine, but there is a hole in the dike of freemen that is bringing in a flood.

There are those who shy away from the use of the term "socialism," or the name of Karl Marx, in connection with what is going on in the power field. But excepting for those who desire socialization, they are blind to the facts. Socialism has become the world's nightmare. It is not the American dream.

Mr. President, on previous occasions the Senate has been told how the technique of smearing public power agencies with the Socialist label was developed. The private utilities had a poll taken which showed that 2 out of 3 citizens approve of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The poll also showed that a ma-

jority of citizens oppose socialism. So ECAP, which is the electric companies' advertising program, advised the private utility managers to quit fighting the TVA and instead to call publicly owned electric services socialistic.

The only contribution Mr. Hoover made was to add the name of Karl Marx to the formula and make him appear to be the ideological father of public power.

The Hoover formula to get the Federal Government out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible has been followed step by step from the beginning down through the atomic energy bill.

Hoover's step No. 1 was that there should be no more appropriations for steam plants or hydroelectric plants solely for power.

That step has been carried out with a vengeance.

Future power shortages in the Pacific Northwest and the Tennessee Valley have been brought on by the elimination of Ice Harbor Dam and TVA steam plants from construction schedules. Even the Dixon-Yates deal, the \$90 million throw-away of taxpayers' money—cannot get power to TVA in time to avert shortages.

The obligations of this great Nation were dishonored in the Southwest both by the repudiation of the REA generating and transmission contracts, and by stopping work on Table Rock Dam. I know that a small sum has been appropriated to start work at Table Rock again—but there is no assurance that REA's will get the power as originally planned. It appears more likely to go to power companies for a markup before it reaches any REA co-op.

New starts were first eliminated by the Bureau of the Budget in its revision of the Truman budget requests. The eliminations were then sustained last year by this Republican Congress with a single exception in South Dakota, Oahe Dam.

The people of this Nation may be more or less immune to repudiation of campaign promises. But I do not believe that they approve such dishonorable disregard of the contracts and the stated obligations of their Government as occurred in the Southwest. But that was the manner in which the new regime started the liquidation of public power in the Southwest—by the repudiation of national obligations. The administration did whatever was necessary—just as the President has started ordering independent agencies around—to halt Federal power projects, as we saw in the Dixon-Yates matter.

Step No. 2 in the Hoover blueprint, which became the Eisenhower power policy, was to halt all multipurpose projects until the power could be peddled or given away to private interests.

This is the step that the House Appropriations Committee attempted to promulgate as a rule in its committee report on Interior funds last year when it proclaimed there would be no appropriations for dams or transmission facilities which private utilities could build. It is a step that has been followed both by the administration and the majority in this Congress in appropriations actions. It is the rule that the Budget Bureau has

openly laid down to delegations seeking the Bureau's approval of projects for the electric power features of any proposed dam.

The third step in the Hoover blueprint was put into motion when this Congress approved the second Commission on Reorganization of the Government, as proposed by the administration.

Mr. Hoover said that Congress, jointly with the President, should establish a temporary commission to develop formula for leasing or otherwise disposing of existing Federal power properties. Congress authorized a general commission on reorganization. As quickly as it was approved, Mr. Eisenhower appointed Hoover to head the commission and the Eisenhower-Hoover union was formalized.

A task force on water and power has been set up in the new Hoover Commission which has obviously set about, not to evaluate power policy objectively but to plan the liquidation of Federal power projects in the A-B-C-D fashion of the Hoover blueprint.

Speaking at the Press Club recently, the ex-President was asked if his water and power task force was not completely stacked against public power advocates.

With a perfectly straight face, Mr. Hoover answered that he had set up a task force excluding representatives of the private utilities. Subsequently public power advocates had demanded some sort of representation. But, Mr. Hoover explained, inasmuch as he had excluded the private utilities from representation, he was not going to reopen the matter and put on public-power representatives.

His effort to paint his water and power task force as an objective group was exactly as preposterous as his reassurances about returning prosperity 22 and 23 years ago.

The Water and Power Task Force of the Second Hoover Commission is stacked to the crow's nest with private-power partisans. There is not a single member who would not be immediately cleared for security so far as private utilities are concerned by the Edison Electric Institute, Electric Co.'s advertising program, the National Electric Light Association, Purcell Smith or the New York investment bankers who always turn out to be principal stockholders in most of our western utility companies.

I say that it is packed to the crow's nest because the task force even has a lookout man—a press relations counsel—who turns out to be none other than Mr. Carl Byoir, who is well known as a result of congressional inquiries, court litigation and lobbying activities. He is a public relations man for the railroads. Mr. Byoir's firm was sued by the trucking interests, and it is apparently qualified for the job with Mr. Hoover's allegedly objective commission because the firm once prepared pamphlets attacking the Tennessee Valley Authority for a client in the gas appliance manufacturing industry. Attacking public-power agencies is therefore an old story to him.

I am curious about Mr. Byoir's position with the Hoover group. He is listed

as attending the initial meeting of the water and power task force on November 23, 1953, which was held, not here at the seat of the Federal Government in Washington, but up in New York City. Byoir was listed as press relations counsel to the task force. I was not aware that the Congress had intended to authorize Mr. Hoover to hire publicity men to help sell the public on the policies he develops. It would be interesting to know how many such publicity men Mr. Hoover has at his Commission, and how much of Federal funds is being paid by them, or if their assistance is being contributed as a public service—it being only coincidental that Mr. Byoir happens to have had clients interested in halting public dams and water projects. This is a matter the Senate should be advised about before it appropriates further funds to the Hoover Commission. I hope the Appropriations Committee will look into it very carefully.

There are 26 members of Hoover's water and power task force. The group includes engineers, lawyers, accountants, and others well qualified to develop the formula for disposing of public-power facilities for which Mr. Hoover called in his Cleveland blueprint. They have the ability to work out Dixon-Yates on a wholesale basis.

There are 10 engineers. Let us examine their background a few moments.

Four years ago, President Truman appointed a National Water Resources Policy Commission. Concurrently, a so-called action panel of the Engineers Joint Council, a private group, was set up to develop what the engineers considered principles of a sound water policy and present them to the President's Commission.

This group filed its findings with the President's Commission. Then, after the President's Commission had acted, this Action group of engineers issued a review sharply attacking the underlying philosophy of the Presidential group. The engineers were opposed to public power. The Engineers Joint Council panel said:

There was a unanimous finding that, while certain recommendations of the President's Commission were acceptable, nevertheless the underlying philosophy of this report was so radically different from that expressed in our June 1950, statement that the two documents are in general incompatible.

The original joint commission report was made by 9 separate panels, but the report gave assurance that the 9 separate committees are unanimously in accord with regard to all fundamentals.

Appearing before Congress, spokesmen for the engineering group subsequently made it clear, in categorical replies, that their recommendation was for private development or bus bar sale of Federal power.

All of this is significant because 9 of the 10 engineers selected by Mr. Hoover for his objective task force were members of the EJC panels. All nine of them joined in the report opposed to public power.

All nine of them are in favor of recommending bus-bar sales of public power.

I make no reflection on the personal integrity of any of these men. To the contrary, I believe they are sincere men. They believe what they advocate, but what they advocate in this matter is not in the public interest.

I object to the increased appropriations in the bill for use by a task force which is supposed to be objective, when an analysis of the objectives of the members of the task force shows that they are biased against public power.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Knowing the Senator from Oregon as I do, and his interest in seeing to it that the general public is looked after and receive rates as cheap as possible, may I ask the Senator if he has ever found that any task force of Mr. Hoover's has pointed out that the people could get electric kilowatts-hours cheaper by having all the facilities owned by private power companies?

Mr. MORSE. They do not point out what the facts are. The facts are that when a program of bus-bar sales is adopted, then the consumers are subjected to taking power from the utilities which supply the power. After the utilities have purchased the power on a bus-bar sales basis, they sell it to the public on the basis of charging what the traffic will bear.

Private utilities, in such situations, invariably charge the consumer high electric power rates. Remove the public power yardstick from any territory, and electric power consumers in that area are forced to pay tribute to the private utility monopoly, which has come to control the power generated by the people's streams in that area.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that the people of the entire northeastern part of the United States today are paying higher electric rates, due to the fact that they do not have any public power yardstick by which to measure whether they are being charged the proper rates?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is absolutely correct. In the northeast region of the country there is no public power yardstick. The result is that the people in that region pay the highest public power rates in the Nation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that in Maine it will be found that the rural cooperatives are paying 15.2 mills a kilowatt-hour?

Mr. MORSE. That is the figure.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In South Carolina, where there is a measuring stick, when one buys power from private corporations the cost is only 6.6 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Mr. MORSE. That is because the private companies in South Carolina are in competition with the public power yardstick.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In both instances the purchases are made from private power companies.

Mr. MORSE. But in the section of the country from which the Senator from South Carolina comes, the private power companies must compete with the public power yardstick.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. MORSE. When the private companies sell according to the public power yardstick rate, they do not lose money, as the income returns of the private utilities in South Carolina will show. They make profits at the low rates.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But in the Northeast, the private power companies have an absolute monopoly.

Mr. MORSE. They make an economic killing there.

Mr. President, as I was saying, I make no reflection on the personal integrity of any of these men. Their position in favor of private development and against public development is publicly known and clear. They have made no pretense of objectivity. It was Mr. Hoover who said it was objective. But Mr. Hoover's task force, I say, is stacked. There is not a public-power proponent on it. The utilities have many known partisans on it regardless of the fact that none may be officers or directors in a private power company.

The nine engineer members of the Hoover task force who have already taken their stand on the private utility side of this policy question include W. W. Horner, Julian Hinds, F. H. Newman, Jr., C. H. Brown, L. V. Murrow, R. J. Tipton, W. D. Shannon, Malcolm Prinie, and A. B. Roberts.

Several of these men have individual records which the public is entitled to know, particularly in view of Mr. Hoover's Press Club statement that he put no private power representatives on his task force.

Who's Who in Engineering for 1948 reports of Mr. A. B. Roberts, one of the task force members:

Since 1935 have made investigations of the business, property, and prospects of various public utilities for investment bankers (including Dillon Reed & Co., Bonright & Co., Mellon Securities Corp., Harriman Ripley & Co.) in connection with issuance of securities in excess of \$1 billion; the aggregate value of the properties investigated is over \$4 billion.

Mr. Roberts wrote a special report for the first Hoover Commission. In that report he said:

The Federal power policy should provide for the utilization of facilities of privately owned utilities in marketing the power from the Federal dams. The privately owned company could: (a) build the power houses and install the generating equipment at each Federal dam where feasible, paying taxes on those facilities and also paying the Government for the use of the falling water and the dam, with the Government retaining full control over each dam and operating the primary purpose of flood control, reclamation or navigation or a combination thereof; or (b) lease the powerhouses and generating facilities as is now done at Hoover Dam; or (c) purchase the power output under long term contracts entered into in advance of construction; and, in any case should (d) build the transmission facilities needed to market the power from Government Dams, and pay the taxes on such transmission facilities.

It is very interesting to note that four members of the original Hoover Commission took exception to the Roberts report, including the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. At the

time the first Hoover Commission reports were filed, our colleague wrote:

The recommendations of the Roberts report (Water Power Resources) and to a lesser extent the recommendations of the Haskins & Sells report (Revolving Funds and Business Enterprises) follow so closely the arguments which the private power interests present in opposition to public water resources development that the general welfare viewpoint does not seem to be properly represented. In my opinion, the usefulness of the Haskins & Sells and Roberts reports is seriously impaired by this approach.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], at another point, commented:

Two of the task force reports, the Roberts report and that of Haskins and Sells, evidence total lack of understanding of the basic reason for Federal multiple-purpose reservoir programs. For example, the Roberts report completely disregards the underlying legislation which establishes these programs, and attempts to compare Federal reservoir development with hydroelectric development by commercial power companies. They are not comparable. The power companies exploit our water resources almost solely for the production of electric energy, with profit as the basic consideration. They are not much concerned with flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, water supply, pollution abatement, fish and wildlife conservation, and recreation—all, or some, of which are important features of the Federal multiple-purpose developments.

That is what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said about the Roberts report. But Roberts is on the Hoover task force. Roberts is one of the so-called objective experts whom the President has put on the task force. Roberts is one of the men who, on the record, clearly is biased in favor of a private utility program. Yet the ex-President told the Press Club that he does not have private utility representatives on his Task Force. He might as well have placed the president of any private utility in America on the task force in place of Mr. Roberts, because Roberts' record shows that he sees eye to eye with the private utility attitude in regard to the uses to which the people's streams should be put.

The other three dissenting commissioners, Acheson, Pollock, and Rowe, dismissed the report as "special pleading and not impartial opinion." That is what they thought of Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Roberts is listed in a report of the House Select Committee on Lobbying as the "source of a publication critical of the TVA which was distributed by the Carolina Light & Power Co. That it is the Roberts whom Hoover put on his task force, for which the committee is now asking increased funds over those which the House of Representatives has recommended—a man about whom, on the record, there can be no doubt as to his bias in favor of private utilities.

There is more material on the objectivity of Mr. Roberts in the water and power field. But perhaps I have presented sufficient to indicate that the private utilities have nothing to fear—and doubtless much to gain—from Mr. Roberts' viewpoint.

WILLIAM D. SHANNON

Now let us take a look at the qualifications of William D. Shannon, another of

the Hoover appointees, who is a Washington State neighbor of mine. Mr. Shannon served on the public utilities committees of both houses of the Washington legislature. He has specialized in arguing about taxes of private utilities and public utility districts, conducting a lengthy exchange on the subject in the letters to the editor column of a Seattle newspaper with the secretary of the Washington Public Utility Districts Association. His bias is clearly on the same side as Roberts and Hoover.

He does not possess the objectivity which the ex-President said was characteristic of the members of his task force when he spoke before the Press Club.

ROBERT W. SAWYER

Robert W. Sawyer is a former Oregon newspaper publisher, and a past president of the National Reclamation Association and of the Oregon Reclamation Association. He is still active in both. He has participated in the work of the reclamation associations which have been against public power and have had private utility contributions. There is no question about the fact that his public statements, when studied, leave no room for doubt as to his bias in favor of a private utility program.

HARRY E. POLK

Harry E. Polk, a North Dakota publisher serving on the present Hoover task force, is another past president of the National Reclamation Association, serving as its legislative chairman and as a director.

The association in 1951 established a Water Policy Committee, and subsequently approved its report, declaring that "Sales of power from Federal developments should be made to public and private customers at the bus bar where possible." Valley authorities or basin commissions were disapproved by it.

In an article entitled "The Road Back," published in September 1952, Mr. Polk advocated giving the Hells Canyon Dam site to the Idaho Power Co., basing his case on an alleged constitutional and God-given right of the States to exercise control over such resources. He said:

When States lose that authority, they have surrendered to a socialist regime, to regimentation of the worst sort.

Mr. Polk has attacked the public-power propaganda machine and the preference clause, and at one time earned a rebuke from the Subcommittee To Study Civil Works of the House Committee on Public Works for applying the Socialist label to that subcommittee in a speech before the National Reclamation Association.

This, I believe, is sufficient to indicate that Mr. Polk is something less than an objective member of Mr. Hoover's Water and Power Task Force.

LESLIE E. MILLER

Now let us turn to Mr. Leslie E. Miller, another member of the Hoover Task Force. Another very distinguished member of Mr. Hoover's Task Force is former Gov. Leslie A. Miller, of Wyoming. Mr. Miller was chairman of the Natural Resources Task Force of the first Hoover Commission and, since that time, has aired his views on power matters in mag-

azine articles and before congressional committees.

One of Mr. Miller's most famous articles was written for the Saturday Evening Post. In that article, Mr. Miller said:

While there may be much to say in favor of Government construction of hydroelectric projects, it is my impression that the United States still is not a socialistic country and that the production and sale of electricity remains a matter of private enterprise.

Then he testified to his own lack of objectivity by writing:

Of course I must plead guilty to a certain amount of bias in expressing my opinions.

That "certain amount" is voluminous.

Governor Miller's article got a big circulation. It was not only reprinted by the Readers Digest; the Edison Electric Institute also reproduced it for the private utilities to circulate. Many thousand copies were circulated in reprint form by the American Gas & Electric Service Corp., Carolina Power & Light Co., the Connecticut Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., and the Public Service Co. of Colorado.

Later, appearing before a congressional committee, Mr. Miller admitted that he "was somewhat in error" in some of his statements; that he had used "a little editorial license"; and that "it could be" that he should have been less violent about some of his charges.

This is the man whom the President has appointed to the task force. This is one of the men who, the ex-President suggested, was objective in his approach to the power problem.

Although Mr. Miller registered strong opposition to valley authorities, he confessed to the committee that he had never personally given much study to TVA, although he had much to say in criticism of TVA.

In his article Mr. Miller called former Administrator Paul Raver, of Bonneville Power Administration, a Socialist, which was categorically denied by Mr. Raver.

And now Leslie Miller is one of the Eisenhower-Hoover team making a study of water and power. He is serving as chairman, I understand, of a study group within the task force. We can only hope he will be more factual than in the past. There are no grounds whatever to hope that he will be free of a galloping bias against Federal power.

J. BRACKEN LEE

Another member of the "Eisenhoover" team is former Gov. J. Bracken Lee, of Utah. The Chattanooga Times wrote that Lee has spoken against Federal intervention in the water resources field on a number of occasions and is a leader in the fight against Hells Canyon Dam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Will the Senator yield so that the Chair, in his individual capacity as a Senator, may make a correction?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. Lee is still the Governor of Utah; he is not a former governor.

Mr. MORSE. Did I say former governor? He is still the Governor, but,

being still Governor does not modify his bias. In my judgment, it puts him in a more strategic position to exercise his bias against the public interest.

WILLIAM B. BATES

Now let us turn to William B. Bates. Mr. William B. Bates, of the Hoover task force, is listed as a director of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce. The executive committee of that organization on September 8, 1953, adopted a resolution that the chamber should immediately launch a campaign to get the Federal Government out of competition with private business and to accomplish the sale to private owners of all Government-owned property not necessary for the legitimate functions of the Government.

Two months later the San Augustine, Tex., Chamber of Commerce protested the earlier action, pointing out it would mean sale of hydroelectric power-producing facilities.

But the resolution stood. The campaign to get the Government out of the power business, among others, is on, and Mr. Bates is on the Hoover Commission task force, theoretically determining the fate of REA, TVA, Bonneville, and other Federal power agencies, on a so-called objective basis.

DONALD R. RICHBERG

Next we come to the name of Donald R. Richberg, once a New Dealer and now a director of the American Natural Gas Co., a holding company which owns an integrated gas utility system. Mr. Richberg writes a column regularly which deplores the extent of the "Federal bureaucracy."

Once upon a time Mr. Richberg wrote a critical commentary about a Supreme Court decision in a gas rate case, noting that the Justice who delivered the opinion had prior experience representing gas utilities in valuation cases.

It will be extremely interesting to watch and see if Mr. Richberg has any comments on the report of the Hoover Task Force on Power because it included a private gas utility director, and how his present view will coincide with his earlier views on a similar situation.

He is clearly, on the record, a man who is biased in favor of the private-utility approach.

CHARLES L. ANDREWS

Charles L. Andrews, Memphis cotton merchant on the Hoover Task Force, told the Chattanooga Times that he was not a supporter of the TVA. He is quoted as saying:

I think that the TVA is something that started out to be a flood-control project and I think they've broadened the field too much.

E. H. KRACKE

Mr. E. H. Kracke is accounting adviser in the task force—a position apparently paralleling that of Mr. Carl Byoir on press relations. He is a partner in Haskins & Sells, the accounting firm serving private utilities, whose report to the first Hoover Commission proved so biased in favor of private utilities that our associate, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] described it as following the private-utility line.

BEN MOREELL

Finally, Mr. President, I come to the chairman of the Hoover Task Force on Water and Power, Ben Moreell, admiral and big steel executive.

Admiral Moreell, has expressed himself about "do gooders," "master-minders," and "planners" in no uncertain terms. He told the National Association of Purchasing Agents in 1950 in Cleveland:

For example, the person who earns the money might want to endow a college or a hospital or a summer camp for poor children; but the planner wants to take the money from him and use it to subsidize cheap electricity for the people who live in Tennessee or the Pacific Northwest.

Admiral Moreell obviously disapproves of our public-power projects. He had publicly served notice that his task force is not bound by any of the sweet words that Eisenhower has directed toward the TVA which, it must be confessed, is more candor than we get from some other quarters.

I understand that the new Hoover Commission is devoting more than 40 percent of all of its funds to this Water and Power Task Force, although there are at least seven other task-force groups. This is not only a disproportionate share of commission funds, it is a waste of money as flagrant as any Mr. Hoover and his commissions have ever uncovered.

Any reasonably intelligent high-school boy or girl, capable of reading and understanding what Mr. Hoover said at Cleveland a year ago, can tell you what policy finding the task force is going to make. And from that point on, the private electric utilities would be happy to take over the work, reappraise the Federal power projects, and develop the formula by which they will take over.

As Mr. Hoover said:

The objective of the whole proceeding should be to get the Federal Government out of the business of generating and distributing money as soon as possible.

This task force is only frosting on the private utility cake, intended to give the great Eisenhower-Hoover giveaway of existing Federal power assets a flavor of righteousness; to make it appear, if they can, that the private utility industry is doing the Nation a great favor when it takes the great white elephants off our hands.

The few hundred thousand dollars that this task force will cost the taxpayers is, of course, small compared to the billions of additional profits that the private utilities will reap annually if they can eliminate the Federal power yardstick.

But if the giveaways by this administration continue, little economies such as paring these funds may be all that the taxpayers ultimately have left. For the benefit of my REA friends, I would like to caution that they not be misled by Mr. Hoover's speech in Cleveland. In that speech Mr. Hoover excluded the Rural Electrification Administration from his discussion "although," he said,

"it receives great Government subsidies." He then explained:

It has a worthy purpose, and that operation is so small a percent of the total power in the country that it cannot eat up the private industry.

But there are other plans for the REA's. Public Utilities Fortnightly has assured the private utility trade that it, too, is to go into liquidation. It reports:

Administrator Nelson considers it his duty to get the job of extending electricity and telephone service to the farmer over as quickly as possible by the best and shortest means possible, with or without REA loans. That means that REA may soon be entering the simple role of liquidating agency for loans outstanding in view of the fact that the farm electrification job is in its final stage.

The farm electrification job is not, of course, in its final stage if reasonably priced electricity is to continue to be available. Power use on farms is growing. Lines will have to be heaved all over this country. Additional generating capacity and transmission systems will be needed even after all farms are on the line; and if we do not take away from these REA's, the cheap power which goes along with the public power yardstick, we shall find, as long as power is used in America, a constantly expanding REA program.

The private electric utilities have argued since before the REA started that farm electrification was in its final stage. They advised REA Administrator Cooke in 1935 that all farms had electricity which needed it. They have told congressional committees year after year ever since that year that the job was done. Senator MURRAY put all the quotations in the RECORD last week when we started a debate on the power issue.

Rural electrification is in its final stage only if the private utilities move in, take the hydro plants, take the atom, and are allowed to have their way. They will stop it, all right, if they regain their monopoly, raise rates, restore the exorbitant connection charges of the twenties and make wired power a luxury in rural America as it was before Uncle Sam moved in with the public power yardstick. It may very well be that just such a happening is what the editor of Public Utilities Fortnightly had in mind when he stated so conclusively that farm electrification is in its final stage. If the Eisenhower-Hoover power giveaway policy continues, then nearly any sort of electrical development will be in its final stage. We may even witness the decline of the great electrochemical industries which are dependent on an abundance of low-cost power for their operations.

Mr. President, there has been no major variation from the Hoover blueprint for liquidation of our Federal power program.

Last summer one of the private utility moguls got impatient about the time being taken. Mr. Ashton B. Collins told a group of utility executives at an Edison Electric Institute meeting:

We cannot take 20 years to undo what has been done to us in the past 20 years. We must do it in 4.

That is frankness, Mr. President. That is confession. That is exactly the impression I have as to what is going on in this country. The monopolistic combines believe they have only the 4 years of this administration to do the job they want to do, and that is to make impotent the Federal power yardstick program. They believe they have only 4 years to bring under control the electric generation facilities of this country.

I am raising my voice in protest again tonight, as I have upon many occasions in the past and will many times in the future, on the floor of the Senate, to warn the American people as to what is happening to them under the giveaway program.

I will not vote, Mr. President, for a committee amendment which seeks to raise by \$200,000 appropriations for a task force which obviously is biased. It is not a task force which on the basis of qualifications of its members can be expected to work in the public interest; I do not care who appointed it. I say therefore there has been an effort on the part of the private utilities to proceed with the liquidation without waiting for the Hoover Commission to develop a giveaway formula. The 20-year contracts in the Bonneville area and the attempted 20-year sales of Missouri Basin power were part of this speedup effort.

Mr. President, I shall urge a ye-and-nay vote on this issue. I want to say, very frankly for the RECORD, why I would like to have a ye-and-nay vote on this issue. I want a record of the votes in the Senate of Senators who are willing to vote an increase in appropriations for a task force which is as obviously biased against the public interest as the qualifications of these men show they are biased.

Mr. President, the differences which exist between us on this issue in the Senate represent very sincere differences of view. They go to a great issue of public policy. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will give me the courtesy of a record vote on this amendment because, in my judgment, a record vote on this amendment will be a significant vote to show where Senators stand on the power issue. In order to get such a vote, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with relation to the amendment. I do so as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and also as a member of the Hoover Commission. An attack has been made upon the Hoover Commission. It is claimed that the Hoover Commission has created

a task force to investigate power and water resources. That is correct. The Commission has created such a task force, and that task force is now at work.

The Hoover Commission is an arm of Congress. Congress created the Commission. Ex-President Herbert Hoover is the Chairman of the Commission. To the Commission there have been appointed two Members of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the senior Senator from Michigan, as well as two Members from the House. That task force and the other task forces were created for the purpose of studying the executive branch of the Government. It was felt that the prior Hoover Commission had not completed its job. Therefore the appointment of a new commission was thought to be essential, and Congress, accordingly, passed a law to that effect. The Senate has named members to the Commission, the House has named Members to the Commission, and the President of the United States has named members to the Commission from the executive branch of the Government.

I do not know whether the junior Senator from Oregon is familiar with the reason for the request for \$254,000.

The House had removed approximately \$50,000, under the impression that there was a duplication of money.

Many of those who serve on the various task forces are not compensated and do not receive any per diem allowances for their services. They are paid for their transportation and living expenses in Washington and wherever else they may have to live in connection with their duties.

Of the \$450,000 that is asked for, the sum of \$200,000 is to be used for an investigation of the CIA. The President of the United States suggested to the Hoover Commission that it would be well to have the Commission set up a task force for the purpose of making a thorough investigation of the CIA, under the direction of Gen. Mark Clark. The sum of \$200,000 for that purpose is not an unreasonable sum of money.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I voted for this amount in committee with the understanding that Gen. Mark Clark, whom I know intimately, and who is now the President of The Citadel in Charleston, S. C., was to investigate the CIA.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not know that he was to investigate the power business.

Mr. FERGUSON. He has nothing to do with power.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I want the Record to be clear in that connection.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are quite a number of task forces in the Hoover Commission. Ben Moreell, a former admiral—

Mr. MAYBANK. I know the admiral quite well.

Mr. FERGUSON. Ben Moreell, a former admiral in the United States Navy, is the chairman of the task force on waterpower.

Mr. MAYBANK. Why was that matter involved in the appropriation, if the President of the Citadel is to investigate the CIA? How did Ben Moreell become involved in that appropriation? Why do we have a situation in which Mark Clark, who has been appointed to investigate the CIA by the Hoover Commission, is confused with the appointment of Adm. Ben Moreell, who is to investigate something else?

Mr. FERGUSON. There are various task forces in the Hoover Commission, and among the task forces created is one to investigate the CIA. We have added an appropriation of \$200,000, which is for the task force being established to investigate the CIA. That is apparently the item which the Senator from Oregon desires to strike out.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make it perfectly clear that the task force under Gen. Mark Clark is to investigate the CIA.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. That is the \$200,000 that has been added in the bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have a considerable interest in the land- and water-use problems of the Missouri Valley. Some of us spent a year on a commission appointed by the President investigating that subject. We presented the results of our findings to President Eisenhower in February 1953. I was wondering whether the distinguished Senator from Michigan could tell us who is in charge of the task force studying land and water uses, which, I take it, comes under that general heading.

Mr. FERGUSON. Water resources and power?

Mr. HENNINGS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Adm. Ben Moreell, a former admiral in the Navy—

Mr. HENNINGS. I know Ben Moreell. He went to school in my city. He used to be in charge of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. He is in charge of that program?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was wondering whether that commission or task force will use the previous report made by the Hoover Commission some 6 or 7 years ago. The report is contained in a large green volume, weighing 5 or 6 pounds, I should judge. As has been said about other books, whether one reads it or not, it is almost impossible to lift the book. We made a report 2 or 3 years ago. We are spending money on various reports. Of course, I do not question the competency of the able men who comprise the Commission. I wonder if the able Senator from Michigan can tell us how the various reports, as well as the various studies that have been made, on our river valleys and our waterways, will be interrelated with relation to power, flood control, irrigation, and reclamation, as well as all the manifold ramifications which come under that general heading.

I wonder whether we are merely to make these reports, with nothing being

done about them. I remember handing our report to the President, in company with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who was a member of that Commission. There were also three Members from the House of Representatives who served on the Commission. We have heard nothing about it since then.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would be unable to tell the Senator exactly.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thought it might be important to make some inquiry along that line.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will make such inquiry, and I shall suggest that use be made of the study made by the Senator's Commission, as well as the other studies.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know whether our study is worth anything. We had a rather large staff, and the Commission consisted of 6 members, appointed from the House and from the Senate, and 5 noncongressional members. We devoted almost a year to the study.

Since then we have heard nothing whatever, either favorable or unfavorable, indicating that the study was to be considered one way or another. I should appreciate it very much if the Senator could give us some idea how we may find out.

Mr. FERGUSON. We shall try to find out.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will read a report showing what this \$553,150 is for?

Task force on overseas operations, \$177,935.

Task force on real property—that is, real property of the United States Government—\$75,080.

Subcommittee on Business Enterprise in the Department of Defense, \$28,780.

Subcommittee on the transportation activities in the Department of Defense, \$52,440.

Subcommittee on the research activities of the Department of Defense, \$23,100.

Additional amount requested for the task force on water resources and power, \$174,055.

Additional amount requested for the task force on legal services and procedure, \$21,760.

The total amount requested in this supplemental budget is \$553,150.

To that is added a new task force which was set up after the Budget Director had approved and sent up the figure of \$553,150, which made \$753,150, or the amount in the bill at the present time.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] now desires to make that figure \$497,835. If we were to take out \$200,000, there would be no money in the budget to enable the Hoover Commission to investigate the CIA, of which investigation the chairman would be Gen. Mark Clark. I think that is the explanation. I hope that the Senate will vote down the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my rebuttal to the Senator from Michigan will be very brief, because one does not have to labor the obvious.

I am not proposing to cut off the CIA appropriation. I am all for it. I say the amount appropriated by the House is ample for the Hoover Commission to do an effective job. My speech went to the point that the water power task force has obviously a biased personnel. It obviously is a private-utility-slanted force. It is not an objective force. It receives 40 percent of the funds appropriated for the Hoover Commission. It has too much money.

Because it is obviously a biased task force and will obviously give us a report on the basis of the public statements of its members, its program will seek to carry out the blueprint of Hoover's Cleveland speech. We ought to save the American taxpayers some money and use part of the money of the Hoover Commission for the CIA investigation. Although the Bureau of the Budget subsequently made its recommendations with respect to the CIA, the House knew the situation, and the House was satisfied that the total job could be done for \$497,835. That is the amount called for in my amendment.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that I have not cut the increase in travel allowance proposed by the Senate committee. I think that was justified.

Mr. President, because 40 percent of the appropriation is going to a biased task force, here is a chance to stand with the House on this item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the House was mistaken. It thought the amount to set up the Hoover Commission task force could come from some fund outside the Hoover Commission. I do not wish at this hour tonight to debate public versus private power. That would be a continuation of the long debate which took place in connection with the atomic energy bill. I do not intend to debate that issue at the present time. The question is, Will the Senate permit the Hoover Commission to finish the work of its task force, which includes studies of water resources and power, the CIA, and other subjects which I have mentioned? If so, then it should vote down this amendment. If we want to stop the Hoover Commission in its tracks, if we do not desire it to go ahead, we should vote for it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to be fair to the Hoover Commission, and I want to help Gen. Mark Clark in every way I can in connection with the CIA, but I do not want to be put in the position of voting for a Hoover Commission task force to be investigating dams and water resources in the West. If I vote for this amendment, is it to help Mark Clark, who is president of The Citadel, to undertake the investigation of the CIA and communism? I do not want a task force to investigate water power in the Missouri Valley, in the Savannah Valley, or in Oregon.

Mr. FERGUSON. All I can say to the Senator is that a task force has been set up which has been in existence for about a year.

Mr. MAYBANK. What has the task force done?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is investigating.

Mr. MAYBANK. Investigating what?

Mr. FERGUSON. Water resources and power in the United States. It is to continue, and the \$200,000 which the committee included was for an investigation of the CIA.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am for the CIA investigation. Do not misunderstand me. As I understand the Senator from Michigan, the \$200,000 goes for the CIA investigation by Gen. Mark Clark.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I must make a very brief reply. The Senator from South Carolina should understand that the adoption of my amendment would not mean the loss of the CIA investigation. It would simply mean that from the total amount of money that the Hoover Commission has it must allocate a portion to the investigations it wants to conduct. Here is an opportunity to make a great saving in connection with the 40 percent that is going to a biased task force which is conducting—really for the private utilities, in my judgment—an investigation of water resources.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not know anything about the private utilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has a pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the

Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—19

Anderson	Humphrey	McClellan
Chavez	Jackson	Morse
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Fulbright	Langer	Sparkman
Hayden	Magnuson	Symington
Hennings	Mansfield	
Hill	McCarran	

NAYS—55

Aiken	Ferguson	Millikin
Barrett	Goldwater	Monroney
Beall	Gore	Mundt
Bennett	Green	Pastore
Bowring	Hendrickson	Payne
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Potter
Bridges	Holland	Purtell
Burke	Ives	Reynolds
Butler	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case	Kennedy	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Knowland	Thye
Cordon	Kuchel	Upton
Crippa	Lennon	Welker
Daniel	Long	Williams
Dworshak	Malone	Young
Ellender	Martin	
Ervin	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—22

Bush	George	Neely
Byrd	Gillette	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kefauver	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Watkins
Eastland	Lehman	Wiley
Flanders	McCarthy	
Frear	Murray	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, would it be possible for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to yield to me for the purpose of asking for the adoption of an amendment to provide money for a commission which has already been set up by law, provided the Senator from Oregon does not lose the floor and that this item can be printed in the RECORD after the Senator has concluded his remarks?

Mr. MORSE. Under those conditions I am happy to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator. I did not want to interrupt him before.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be stated.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I suggest that this amendment should go in between lines 15 and 16 on page 35, under the heading of "Independent Offices."

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 35, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL USE OF INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the necessary expenses of the Commission on Governmental Use of International

Telecommunications, established by Act of July 29, 1954 (Public Law 558), \$150,000.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, last year I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 96, which passed the Senate and was sent to the House. Senate Joint Resolution 96 was passed by the House of Representatives last week, and became law July 29 last, just 2 or 3 days ago. It had not become a law at the time the appropriation bill came from the House of Representatives, or at the time the Senate committee was acting upon the independent offices appropriation bill.

Senate Joint Resolution 96 sets up a commission, with a staff, for the purpose of studying the use of international telecommunications and international networks for the purpose of the American information program, and to assist network information all over the world. It is a study commission in a very vital field, in which I am sorry to say the United States today is lagging and other countries are forging ahead.

The joint resolution, as passed and as it has become law, authorizes an appropriation of \$250,000 to carry out the provisions of the act. However, the law requires, as it is presently written, a report to be made on or before next December 31. As I say, that matter was taken up last year. Without doubt this act will have to be amended.

I am only asking, in view of the fact it is late in the session, and the fact that consideration will be necessary at a later date, that \$150,000 of the \$250,000 provided in the act be included in this bill. As I say, I had no opportunity to go before the Appropriations Committee, because this act did not become public law until July 29.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator from Iowa that there is an amendment pending before the Senate. It will require unanimous consent to secure present consideration of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I had asked consent of the Senator from Oregon that he yield for the purpose of allowing me to present the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator asked the Senator from Oregon to yield, but in order for his amendment to be considered by the Senate as a whole, the Senate itself must give unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I bow to the judgment and wisdom and ruling of the Chair. I desire to do whatever is necessary to ask for unanimous consent, in order to bring this amendment before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am submitting this amendment to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I understand that the unanimous-consent request is for consideration of the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the first step which must be taken.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In fairness, I wanted to discuss the amendment with the Senator from New Hampshire before it was acted upon.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that I know in general about the amendment he proposes and the importance of the work. However, this subject did not come before our committee. We had no opportunity to examine it.

I was notified by the Director of the Budget that this proposal was coming up here, and that it had the approval of the President.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. There are just two questions which have been raised since we were notified this amendment was coming up. The first is, Is this a one-shot proposition? In other words, is this job to be done with a single report, or will this be one of those continuing commissions?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hope that it is not a continuing commission.

We can compare it to any number of commissions, such as the Randall Commission and other study commissions. It is the same type of commission.

So far as my intention is concerned, this commission should make its survey, develop its facts, make its report, and go out of business. I say it will probably have to be continued, because when the joint resolution was originally introduced last year it provided that a report should be made on or before December 31, 1954.

I have included in my amendment only \$150,000, rather than the \$250,000 which is the full authorization. I feel at this moment that \$150,000 will be ample, until such time as Congress can act on this question again. If I did not feel so, I should have asked for the full \$250,000.

I assure the Senator that I believe this commission will operate as expeditiously and as conservatively as possible.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is familiar with this situation.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I should like to add that I think it is one of the most meritorious programs.

In answer to the very logical question asked by the chairman of the committee, namely, whether we are establishing a continuing commission, I can assure him that, from my standpoint and my knowledge of it, it is not to be a continuing commission. It is to have a one-shot job. The Commission will make a specific recommendation, and then will go out of existence.

But I join with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] in suggesting that the date be changed from 1954 to 1955, because of the lateness in creating the Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not know whether we can change the date in this bill.

If it is parliamentary permissible—and I understand that I must ask unanimous consent for this purpose, in view of the fact that the joint resolution was

introduced last year, but did not pass the House until this year, and in view of the further fact that the date in the original joint resolution is "on or before December 31, 1954"—let me say that I fully realize the parliamentary situation, and I now ask unanimous consent that the date be changed to December 31, 1955. This will allow approximately 1 year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The Senator from Iowa may modify his own amendment, as a matter of right, without obtaining unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But, Mr. President, I am trying to change the date in Senate Joint Resolution 96, by means of a rider in the proper form to the pending appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Since the amendment is being offered to the pending bill, the Chair rules that the Senator from Iowa has a right to modify his own amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No, Mr. President; I am referring to the original joint resolution. I hold in my hand a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 96. I now ask unanimous consent—if it is permissible—to offer to the pending bill the following amendment: At the proper place, to amend Senate Joint Resolution 96, section 8 (a)—

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe we can take care of the parliamentary situation by simply adding to the appropriation item the words:

Provided, That the date of termination of Senate Joint Resolution 96 shall be extended to December 31, 1955, in lieu of December 31, 1954, as provided in that act.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has a right to modify his own amendment; and the amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have no objection to the proposed change in the date. However, inasmuch as this matter has never been before the committee, I wish to state that if the Senator from Iowa believes that half of the authorization of \$250,000—that is \$125,000—rather than the full amount of \$250,000, will be a fair amount, and if he will also agree to allow it to come in in the regular way, I shall be glad to take to conference the amendment with that modification.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I think that is a reasonable request. So I am glad to modify my amendment by changing the amount to \$125,000, although with the understanding that with the matter going over to the next year, I cannot give either the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Iowa as a whole any assurance that the work could be done for that amount; and thus I may have to offer a further item, next year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

On page 35, after line 15, insert the following:

"COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL USE OF
INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS
"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For necessary expenses of the Commission on Governmental Use of International Telecommunications, established by act of July 29, 1954 (Public Law 558), \$125,000: *Provided*, That the date of termination of such Commission is hereby changed from December 31, 1954, to December 31, 1955."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received two requests to yield to other Senators, so that they may submit amendments which I understand will require 3 or 4 minutes each. Of course, in connection with the debate on an appropriation bill—or, for that matter, on any other bill of such nature—I am always glad to accommodate my fellow Senators, particularly when the amendment I am offering raises a policy question, and therefore calls for the making of a record in regard to the policy.

So I am willing to yield, first, to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON], and subsequently to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], so as to make it possible for the Senate to consider amendments which they tell me are noncontroversial, and which they believe will not require lengthy debate. Under the circumstances, I yield to them for that purpose, subject to the following conditions: First, that I do not lose my right to the floor; second, that following action on their amendments, I shall be allowed to proceed with my amendment; third, that if debate on their amendments becomes extended, the authors of the amendments will understand that I mean no discourtesy to them if I decline to yield further for continued consideration of their amendments.

Mr. President, I wish to state that in yielding at this time I desire to have it understood that my amendment will be displaced temporarily, while these Senators offer their amendments.

With that understanding, I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Oregon to state that if his request is agreed to, he will temporarily withdraw his amendment, if it is further understood that in doing so, he will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I mean.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] is recognized.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon in permitting me to submit my amendments at this time.

I now offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 51, in line 25, it is proposed to strike out "\$8,275,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$8,415,000."

On page 52, in line 6, after the word "Provided", it is proposed to insert "That \$140,000 of this appropriation shall be available only for the prosecution of the project for beach erosion control at Hampton Beach, N. H., as authorized by law: *Provided further*."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON], which, without objection will be considered en bloc.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. President, these amendments call for an appropriation of \$140,000 for the prosecution of a beach-erosion project at Hampton Beach, N. H. This item was not submitted to the Appropriations Committee in the regular course, because when the committee hearing was being held on this supplemental appropriation bill, there was doubt whether the project would be authorized. The project is included in the rivers and harbors bill which has passed the House of Representatives, and is now on the Senate Calendar, and is reasonably certain of being passed by the Senate before the adjournment of this Congress.

However, the amendment provides, in effect, that the appropriation shall not be effective unless the project is authorized by law.

This is a cooperative project in connection with which the State of New Hampshire will contribute two-thirds of the cost, and the United States Government one-third of the cost. In other words, the total cost will be approximately \$420,000, of which the United States, by virtue of this appropriation item, will contribute \$140,000. The State of New Hampshire has appropriated the necessary funds on its part. The Department of Defense has approved the project.

All that remains to launch the project is to have the appropriation made by Congress.

I shall not go further into the matter unless that is desired; I believe the statement I have made will suffice for the purpose of action by the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to my distinguished colleague that my understanding is that the bill carrying the authorization for this item has passed the House of Representatives, has been reported favorably by our committee to the Senate, is on the Senate Calendar, and in all probability will come up when the calendar is called on Saturday. It is also my understanding that the bill probably will be in conference several days after it is passed—so I judge, from the appearance of things, and knowing some of the problems which face any conference. I further understand that the State of New Hampshire will contribute two-thirds of the cost, that the Federal Government will contribute one-third, and that the money is available.

Mr. President, as chairman of the committee, I am somewhat embarrassed, because this item relates to the State of New Hampshire, and my distinguished

colleague has offered the amendment. However, I hope that if, as chairman of the committee, I accept the amendment and agree to take it to conference, there will not be an impression that I am doing so because the amendment affects my State. I wish to state that I believe the matter is worthy of consideration by the committee; and that will be the basis of my agreement to accept the amendment and take it to conference. On that basis only, as chairman of the committee, I shall accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON].

Without objection—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the amendment is adopted, let me say, as a member of the Committee on Public Works—if a statement on my part will be of any assistance to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]—that I believe the proposal of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] is a very sound one for a project very much in the public interest, and I believe the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. President, again I thank the Senator from Oregon for his very great courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me at this time?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, under the conditions I have previously stated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon.

I now offer, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], on behalf of himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 46, in line 2, before the period, it is proposed to insert "*Provided further*, That the provisions of section 708 of Public Law 458, approved June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 350), shall not apply to 250 units of family housing provided for by this act but the individual cost of such units shall in no event exceed \$20,000 per unit."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have taken up this amendment with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and with the chairman of the Military Subcommittee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

In the bill \$175 million is appropriated for military housing.

The provisions of a general law limit the price which can be paid for these

houses to certain figures. The only exception is the 250 houses for general officers which are in the authorization bill. The houses are slightly larger than the standard size.

The amount in the authorization bill, is even more; it is greater than \$20,000; but by agreement with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] I put in a top limit of \$20,000. I understand the amendment is acceptable, and I hope it may be adopted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In substance, as so excellently explained by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the amendment provides for 250 homes for general officers under the military construction program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is right.

Mr. MAYBANK. Whether an officer be an admiral or a general in command of a military post, naturally, he has to have more room than his subordinate officers in view of the large number of visitors he receives and the good will he has to create.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when the family housing for the military came up, in the amount of \$175 million, there was considerable discussion in the committee, as most of the Members remember, relative to the Federal Government's participation in housing for military people to that extent. So we wrote the following provision into the bill, which will be found on page 45:

Provided, That funds appropriated under this heading shall not be used for family housing unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that (1) it is impracticable to construct family housing under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act—

That is the Wherry housing, I might say—

and (2) that adequate housing at reasonable rental rates is not available in the immediate vicinity of the military installation, and (3) it is impracticable to acquire suitable housing under other existing provisions of law.

With those safeguards we approved the \$175 million for housing because of its essentiality to the enlisted men and officers of the military forces.

There was a discussion as to a higher limitation for a certain number of houses. It was not acted upon by the committee. The total amount of the cost allowance for each individual unit was considerably higher than that provided in the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and there was a reasonable and, I think, normal objection to that higher unit cost. But now that the Senator comes in here and offers an amendment limiting it to \$20,000 for only 250 of the 11,500 units in all, the Senator from New Hampshire thinks he is approaching it in a practical way, and is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous arrangement, the floor returns to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in order to make his amendment again the pending business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. May I say that two other colleagues wish me to extend the courtesy of yielding to them. Before any Senator gets a wrong idea, may I say, Mr. President, that these are the only two, so far as I am concerned, whom I shall further accommodate, because I think I have been very reasonable, but I want to get on with my discussion of my own amendment. But, Mr. President, I will yield, if there are no objections, under the same conditions to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]; and then, Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] each of whom, I understand, has an amendment that the chairman of the committee [Mr. BRIDGES] is willing to take to conference.

I yield first to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. WATKINS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, line 13, it is proposed to change the period to a comma and to add the following:

Provided, That hereafter hearing officers appointed for Indian probate work need not be appointed pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) as amended.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the bill contains an item of \$100,000 to take care of some backlog of probates on Indian fractionated heirships.

We have over 2,000 of them, and we are trying to get them cleaned up so that we can make progress in solving some of the Indian problems. Many of these lands are lying idle today. The Indians cannot use them because of the multiplicity of owners whose names have never been determined. We have in some cases as many as 30 people owning a 40-acre tract, and it becomes very difficult to handle these matters.

Ordinarily, of course, we would have to give examinations for people to take care of the job, which we hope will be done in 2 years.

The committee has allowed us \$100,000 in the bill for this purpose. We think we can get some young lawyers who can take the job, and because they have to comply with the probate laws of the State in which the lands are located, they will be able immediately to enter upon the work and get it done. Our hope is and our program in this respect, has been to get it done as speedily as possible so that we can go forward with this Indian program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee has no objection to the language change. In fact, he approves the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for extending to me the courtesy of the floor. I rise to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on July 6 we passed Senate Joint Resolution 140, to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton.

Section 7 of the joint resolution provides:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

However, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I did not ask the Appropriations Committee to include any funds because the House did not act on its portion of this joint resolution until late this afternoon. In acting, I may say, they limited the amount that could be spent to \$10,000 for this Commission.

Very frankly, I am skeptical about the capacity of the Commission to get the job done for \$10,000, but since we must operate under that limitation, I have taken up with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BRIDGES] the amendment to include \$10,000 in this bill for Senate Joint Resolution 140, and I believe he has agreed to take that amendment to conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator please state just what he is asking again? I understand the joint resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. This amendment provides \$10,000 for conducting the work of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission. It was the feeling of some 35 or 40 of us, who joined in introducing the joint resolution that it would probably require \$50,000 to really undertake the work of the Commission. But in approving our joint resolution, the House wrote into it a limitation of \$10,000, and rather than retard the beginning of the Commission, I felt that it would be well for us to appropriate \$10,000, get on with the work, and if next year we find out that our guess was closer than the House guess, we can come back to the committee for a supplemental appropriation, of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from South Dakota consider adding the name of Andrew Jackson to the joint resolution, so that it may provide for a joint memorial?

Mr. MUNDT. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that this is in the nature of a sequel to the one which honored Thomas Jefferson. Therefore it is in the nature of an equalizing joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the name of Andrew Jackson should be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. MUNDT. The purpose of the amendment is to provide \$10,000 for carrying out the purposes of Senate Joint Resolution 140.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Where in the bill does the Senator from South Dakota propose to add the amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. On page 63, at the end of line 24.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from South Dakota consider adding the name of Aaron Burr to that of Alexander Hamilton?

Mr. MUNDT. We are on the Hamilton side of the feud at this time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, while the Senator from New Hampshire knows nothing about the details of the proposed amendment, and does not know what the reaction of the House will be, he does recognize the part which Alexander Hamilton played in the history of the United States. It is probably wise to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton, and I shall certainly be glad to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. I am sure the House will be very happy to have a limitation placed on the amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this supplemental appropriation bill provides funds to be used by the Civil Defense Administration to finance the establishment of permanent headquarters at Battle Creek, Mich. The original plans of that agency announced in 1951 provided for the establishment of its permanent headquarters at Olney, Md., the present site of its training center and where the Civil Defense Administration has already incurred a large capital investment in Government funds.

As a Senator from Maryland, let me say that the establishment of headquarters at Battle Creek would naturally be adverse to the interests of my State. However, my objections to this proposal far transcend any interest in it that I may have as a Senator from the State of Maryland. I firmly believe that if the headquarters of this most important agency are moved to Battle Creek, Mich., it will sound the death knell to our civil-defense program.

We owe our citizens the paramount obligation to see to it that our Nation has the most effective civil-defense program the intellect and resources of man are capable of providing. My studies of this proposal indicate beyond a doubt that the decision to move the civil defense headquarters to Battle Creek was based upon the most cursory of investigations, and is fatally defective so far as

the administration of this agency is concerned. In a recent letter to the President concerning this proposal, I stated several of the more important factors which clearly indicate to me that Battle Creek is not the proper site for this facility. By way of clarification, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of July 22, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 22, 1954.

THE PRESIDENT,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Federal Civil Defense Administration has recently announced plans to establish its permanent headquarters at Battle Creek, Mich. At the present time temporary headquarters are located in the District of Columbia and the Administration's training center is located at Olney, Md. Prior to this announcement, permanent headquarters were also to be located at Olney.

I question the merit of this proposal and believe that it is in the best interest of the Government and, more specifically, our civil-defense program, that the headquarters of the Administration be located at Olney, Md., as has been the plan since 1951 when the Civil Defense Administrator selected that site for its headquarters and training center. There are serious financial and administrative reasons why the civil defense headquarters should not be located at Battle Creek.

Preliminary studies and estimates would indicate that the cost of remodeling the premises and moving personnel to Battle Creek alone might exceed \$1,500,000. In addition, substantial amounts of specialized equipment presently at Olney will have to be moved at prohibitive cost. As an example, it is my understanding that it will cost the Civil Defense Administration about \$100,000 simply to disconnect and terminate existing communication facilities. As another example, the proposed move will require the abandonment of "Rescue Street," a training facility at Olney simulating bombed-out buildings, which I am advised cost almost \$500,000. As these examples indicate, the Government investment at Olney to a very great extent appears to be in labor and other installation costs rather than in the intrinsic value of the equipment involved, which means that the capital loss will be substantial should the proposed move take place.

Loss of investment, however, is but one aspect of this problem. More important is the functioning of the agency itself. The Civil Defense Administration is not a self-sustaining, all-inclusive organization. On the contrary, it is essentially a coordinating agency which relies upon the staffs of the other agencies and departments of the Federal Government. It has made delegations of responsibilities fixing areas of research and development in some 20 other Federal agencies. As an example, only last week you announced the delegation of extensive civil defense responsibilities to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Furthermore, each Federal agency relies upon such liaison in the establishment of its own civil defense program for continued operations in the event of enemy attack.

Thus, should the headquarters be moved to Battle Creek, which would make this liaison extremely difficult and costly, if not impossible, not only would the nationwide civil defense program be severely compromised, but also, the essential program relating to the emergency operation of the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government.

While I understand that these new plans call for a small liaison staff in Washington, it is questionable whether a handful of employees could even hope to maintain the

necessary contact with the other agencies of the Government.

I have also been advised that the Civil Defense Administration proposes to have its high officials available in Washington for consultation during emergencies. Yet, in time of emergency fate can play cruel tricks on man's endeavors. Would chance or circumstance find the proper officials in the vicinity of Washington at the time of an enemy attack? If not, could subordinates stationed almost 1,000 miles away take their places on a moment's notice?

For such reasons as these I believe that Battle Creek is manifestly an unfortunate choice for the site of the headquarters of this most important agency. On the other hand, Olney, Md., appears to be a most effective location both for the headquarters and the training center. While it is not located in any target area, nevertheless it is in the heart of the industrial East where most of the target areas are found. Most States and cities can thus send their key civil defense personnel the short distance to Olney at comparatively low cost. In addition, it is my understanding that the accessibility of Olney and present facilities and accommodations allow for a most intense training program there than would be possible at Battle Creek where distances are great and accommodations are poor.

There is the question as to Olney being too close to Washington, which admittedly would be a priority target area in case of war. It should be pointed out, however, that Olney is outside the area of major damage from blast and fire effects.

The advent of the hydrogen bomb leads me to believe that an entirely new concept of civil defense must be developed. The hydrogen bomb, together with germ or bacteriological warfare and other hideous weapons, in my opinion requires that Civil Defense be considered in terms other than the mass evacuation of our cities. The entire question of relocation of civilian, industrial, and Government facilities must be reexamined in view of the fact that it is now obvious that all essential facilities cannot be placed beyond the reach of these new weapons. It would seem to me that the first step in this reappraisal might well be the construction of a model headquarters building at Olney designed in accordance with the latest knowledge and technical information available relating to the design of buildings capable of withstanding blast, radiation, and fire of thermonuclear weapons.

Accordingly, I most respectfully urge that this plan to move the civil defense headquarters and training center to Battle Creek, Mich., be reconsidered. It is essential, in my opinion, that the headquarters be located within commuting distance of Washington so it can effectively carry out its functions in time of emergency. No place on earth is now entirely safe from the ravages of these new weapons, and compromises must be made in weighing safety as against effectiveness. Furthermore, to a great extent the work of this organization will have to be performed prior to the time of emergency, as probably its greatest task lies in the training of local and regional civil defense officials and workers. This training program can be more effectively carried out in the middle Atlantic region of our country, with Olney, Md., as the most obvious site. To pass up Olney or some other site in this section in favor of a converted Army hospital in Michigan, a facility which itself would be sorely needed in time of emergency, would be, in my opinion, a most drastic mistake and constitute an incalculable setback to the essential preparations our country must make to protect itself and thus to survive during this age of thermonuclear weapons.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that the Senator from Maryland is objecting and intends to raise the point of order that this would be an appropriation of prior funds, and therefore would require a suspension of the rule and a two-thirds vote. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest to the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], that this amount be stricken out as an appropriation of prior funds, and that the chairman then move to add \$350,000 on page 62, line 22.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Maryland will not yield for that purpose. Mr. FERGUSON. I desired to shorten the argument being made by the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. I would rather prolong it.

It is my belief that the factors discussed in this letter clearly demonstrate the need for the postponement of this move or transfer. In addition, contacts with my office indicate that housing conditions at Battle Creek are abominably poor; that the vast majority of Civil Defense employees will not move to Battle Creek, and that if Battle Creek is a proper location for this headquarters, a thorough investigation will substantiate that conclusion. On the other hand, if the proposal is unsound and would jeopardize the entire civil-defense program, as I clearly foresee, it is our duty, in the highest sense of the word, to see that this fact is established prior to the time the present headquarters staff is disbanded and the agency is demoralized and disorganized by this unfortunate transfer.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BEALL. Is it not a fact that if the headquarters should be moved to Battle Creek, Mich., it would be housed in what were formerly hospital buildings?

Mr. BUTLER. That is true.

Mr. BEALL. Is it not a fact that the Army has reserved the right to take back the buildings in the event of another war?

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to my dear colleague from Maryland that in the event of an emergency the Civil Defense headquarters would last 5 minutes in the location to which it is now proposed to move it. In addition to that, \$1½ million will have to be spent to make the facilities there available to the agency.

I wish to point out to my colleagues that in 1953 the agency entered into a contract with respect to communications, which contract was for a period of 10 years, at a monthly rental of \$3,000. If the agency does not live up to its contract, it will cost the Government about \$80,000, less one-one hundred and twentieth for each month of occupation, which will make the penalty approximately \$72,000. In addition to that, there has been expended a half million dollars for what is known at Olney, Md.,

as Rescue Street, which represents a large capital investment.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BEALL. Considerably more than a half a million dollars has been spent. As a matter of fact, Olney was picked by the last two administrations as an ideal location, and was established by Mr. Flemming as being beyond the danger zone.

Mr. BUTLER. I may say to my colleague that his point is absolutely correct. I do not know of anyone who has stated that Olney, Md., was not an ideal location for the civil-defense headquarters. The location is 20 miles from the Capital City. I would think that is an ample distance away. I can see no reason for moving that fine facility, which has been established at great expense to the taxpayers.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee came into the Chamber late. May I ask to where it is proposed to move the facility?

Mr. BUTLER. It is being proposed that the facility be moved to Battle Creek, Mich., into buildings which were formerly occupied by a hospital, which buildings, in the event of an emergency, would be absolutely essential for use by the Department of the Army or the Department of the Navy.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Why is it proposed to move the agency from the vicinity of the United States Capital to Michigan?

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to know the answer to that question. I can find no sound reason for moving the fine facility from the State of Maryland. I may also inform my colleagues that from the headquarters at Olney, Md., there are microwave communications to one of the larger cities on the eastern seaboard, which system could not be replaced for thousands and thousands of dollars. It would be utterly ridiculous to move the agency from that fine facility.

Mr. GORE. Does the amendment of the Senator from Maryland provide that the agency shall not be moved?

Mr. BUTLER. In due time the senior Senator from Maryland is going to make a point of order on the basis that this is an appropriation of unexpended funds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, the Civil Defense Headquarters at Olney is now located in rental property, and the rental has been adjusted in such a way that it will prove to be an economy to the Government. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER. It is my understanding that the rental has been adjusted downward. The headquarters could not have a better landlord or facility for that type of operation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not also true that the Government, when it first entered into the contract, agreed with the landlord or with the owner of the property to use it for a rather extended period of time?

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct, and the Government has expended a very large amount of money on the basis of such commitment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is also true, is it not, that the Federal Government has invested in the installation an amount of money running into the hundreds of thousands of dollars, for the purpose of renovation and redesigning in order properly to adjust the facility for the purposes of civil-defense training?

Mr. BUTLER. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would not all that money be lost if the move were to be made?

Mr. BUTLER. All of that money would be lost. The initial investment in the project would be lost. The Government would be required to pay a large penalty for disconnecting its communication systems, and these would be abandoned at great expense.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to state that I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Maryland, and I am familiar with some of the details involved. I assure him that he shall have my support for his proposal.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I know the distinguished Senator from Maryland wishes to be fair. He knows, does he not, that the anticipated move to Battle Creek will result in housing the entire Civil Defense headquarters? The Olney program is a training program in a demonstration area. The administration headquarters is here in Washington. There have been no shenanigans on the part of any members of the Michigan delegation in trying to get the Civil Defense headquarters to move to Battle Creek. I am sure the Senator from Maryland is aware of the fact that the program of the President has been to utilize as much of the property that belongs to the Federal Government as possible, in order to avoid paying rent.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I yielded for a question. I should like to answer the statement of the distinguished Senator from Michigan by saying that simply because it is desired to carry out the directive of the President, it does not follow that the Government should abandon a perfectly fine and useful location and facility, in which the Government already has a large investment.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Maryland is also aware of the fact, is he not, that the Government will save from \$200,000 to \$225,000 a year if the transfer is made?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not see how any money can be saved by the transfer, when there is taken into consideration the fact that there will have to be spent approximately \$1½ million in putting the Battle Creek property into proper condition. The Government will lose a

half a million dollars in capital investment. Also, about \$72,000 will be lost as a result of termination of the contract at Olney. In addition, there will be the cost of moving the agency. I remain firmly convinced that the civil defense of the country cannot be effectively operated that far from the Capital. The personnel of the agency will probably be traveling back and forth on airplanes and trains incessantly. I think such an agency must be within easy reach of the Capital of the United States. I am sure it could not be said that it would be desirable to have the Pentagon move to an area in Michigan. The Pentagon must be close to Washington. The Civil Defense headquarters is the agency that will develop and maintain the protection and preservation of our people in case of attack. The agency should properly be near Washington, close to the seat of Government. The agency does not belong in Michigan.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota was interested in the remark which the Senator from Maryland made a few minutes ago with regard to the fact that the rent had been adjusted downward. It intrigues me because the Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction of the Committee on Armed Services, for a period of more than a year, has frequently been confronted with the problem of the adjustment of rents. Originally the facility in Olney, Md., was authorized by the predecessor committee at a rental of about \$36,000 a year, as I understand. In any event, when it was time to extend the lease, the subcommittee was asked to clear the rental at \$48,000 a year. We suggested that appraisals be obtained, and the appraisers fixed the fair rental value at from \$32,000 to \$55,000 a year. In any event, it was the opinion of the committee that the lease should be settled at \$36,000 a year, which was the originally authorized amount. I think the matter was taken into court, and the suggestion was that it could not be settled for less than \$48,000.

Does the Senator from Maryland mean to say it is agreeable now to settle the lease at \$36,000?

Mr. BUTLER. I think that is correct, although I do not wish to be bound by it.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator from South Dakota that it is a matter of record that the Federal court authorized the payment of \$48,000 a year.

Mr. CASE. When?

Mr. BEALL. In 1952, as I recall. I believe that was the figure which was authorized.

Mr. CASE. That does not wholly conform to the understanding I had, I may say.

I may add that what has disturbed the subcommittee on real estate and military construction is that the landlord was attempting to collect rent for property consisting of 50 acres, but at the same amount that the appraisers—

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, for the pur-

pose of clarifying this matter, my colleague be allowed to answer the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] without causing me to lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. I shall be glad to have that done, but first I should like to finish stating my point.

Mr. BUTLER. Very well.

Mr. CASE. Some appraisers were brought in. The appraiser upon whom the landlord seemed to rely most said the property should bring as much if rented with merely 50 acres as if it were rented with approximately 250 acres; in other words, that no decrease should be made in the rent because of the deletion of approximately 200 acres of good Maryland land from the property rented.

The committee was confronted with that proposal, but did not give its approval to the larger figure.

Of course, if the matter has gone to court and has been decided by the court, that is different.

But I was intrigued by the statement of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] that the settlement had been accomplished downward, because that would bear upon this problem.

Mr. BUTLER. It was my understanding that an offer was made in that connection.

Mr. BEALL. The Senator from South Dakota may not remember it, but the original contract was for 543 acres. The reason for the inclusion of only 50 acres is that the buildings were on the 50 acres of land. The buildings which originally were taken over were on the 50-acre tract. The remainder of the 543 acres—or approximately 493 acres, as I recall—would bring the \$48,000 rental.

Furthermore, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota, because he was on the subcommittee, to the fact that an agreement was actually made with the landlord to buy this land.

The senior Senator from Tennessee knows that. The Government entered into an agreement in 1951 or 1952 to buy that land. So the school was abandoned.

Because of the fact that the property rights of the owners are affected in this manner, there is the element that they are entitled to remuneration. The Government could not simply walk in and take over the property without making payment. However, as a matter of fact, the Government has paid them nothing.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I think we have discussed the point sufficiently.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I merely wished to establish the fact, if it is one, that the landlord is now willing to accept rent of \$36,000 a year.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know that to be so.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have heard of complaints from the employees who are stationed in Maryland. I do not know about the merits of the transfer, or what its effect will be, or whether the project will be as effective

and as efficient in Michigan as in Maryland.

However, I understand that many of the employees will not be transferred to Michigan, because, instead, they will quit their jobs.

Mr. BUTLER. That is true; the trained personnel will not go to Battle Creek, Mich.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I have been told.

Mr. BUTLER. If this move is made, I say to the Senator from South Carolina, the civil defense organization will be broken up, and that will occur at a time when it should not be broken up.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who is handling this matter?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. What is his observation with respect to the statements made by the two distinguished Senators from Maryland, to the effect that this important installation is being moved to Battle Creek, Mich.; and that in the event of an emergency, there will be no place for it to go, because it will have to evacuate the hospital buildings, and furthermore, we shall lose the benefit of the giant cable lines about which I have heard, and also we shall lose the benefit of the installations which have been made. I should like to hear from the chairman of the subcommittee on that point.

Mr. BUTLER. First, Mr. President, I should like to complete my statement.

On page 62 of the bill, in lines 22 through 25, the text of the amendment proposed by the Appropriations Committee, provides "That not to exceed \$350,000 of the unobligated balance of the 1954 appropriation for this purpose shall remain available until June 30, 1955."

The committee report reveals that the purpose of the amendment was to make these funds available "in order to provide funds for moving the major portion of the operations to Battle Creek, Mich."

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provides, in part, that—

No general appropriation bill or amendment thereto shall be received or considered in either House if it contains a provision reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations.

Accordingly, Mr. President, on the basis of that rule, it is my purpose to raise a point of order against the inclusion of the aforesaid provision in this appropriation bill.

Mr. PAYNE rose.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine wishes me to yield to him at this time, I gladly do so.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I appreciate the willingness of the distinguished Senator from Maryland to yield to me. I should like to ask whether he is aware of the fact that in addition to the training facilities and the school available at Olney, to which reference has been made, in which the training of Civil Defense personnel from over the country takes place, there has been maintained in the District of Columbia a very extensive and

very costly executive set of offices for all the rest of the personnel.

Mr. BUTLER. That is perfectly true; yes.

Mr. PAYNE. If the Senator from Maryland will permit me to speak further on this matter for a moment—

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish to call attention to the fact that I happened to have the privilege of serving as 1 of the 3 governors of this Nation who served on a 9-member board of the National Advisory Council of Civil Defense, named by the President, during the period from 1950 up to 1953, and in that period of time I had an opportunity to visit Olney and observe the operations of the training school.

On the other hand, I also had an opportunity to observe the operations of the headquarters which is located in the District of Columbia, and I knew of the fact that it was located in a very congested area and one where the rent was very costly.

I wish to ask a question: Is the Senator from Maryland aware of the statement appearing on page 464 of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate? At the bottom of that page we find the following statement which was made by Mr. Val Peterson, formerly Governor of Nebraska and now the Civil Defense Administrator:

Consistent with the need for dispersal and continuity of Government, FCDA, as you may know, is now in the process of moving our national office from Washington to Battle Creek, Mich., in order to get our agency and our people out of the critical target area of Washington. I am convinced that this Nation's Capital will be one of the very first targets on an aggressor's list and, unless we take this step to protect ourselves, we simply are not going to be around to do our jobs after the attack comes.

Is the Senator aware of that statement?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, I am.

Mr. PAYNE. May I further ask whether or not the Senator is aware of the fact that as early as 1951, on the briefing by the best authority available at the Federal level at that time, and under the direction of the then former Governor Caldwell, of Florida, who was then the Civil Defense Director for this Nation, the same argument was put forth by him and by the agencies in Washington, that it was essential for the needs of our national defense and to create an effective civil defense organization that would be able to act regardless of where the target area happened to be, that it should be removed from the area of Washington and placed outside of the vale of that which was then considered a most vital target area?

Mr. BUTLER. He may have had that idea. But if the Senator is going to do that, we might as well take the Pentagon out, and all the other vital agencies of the Government.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further—

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. Is it not true that we are at present and have been for some period of time discussing very seriously the proposition of endeavoring to disperse, insofar as practical, those essential agencies of the Government so as not to have all of our eggs in one basket?

Mr. BUTLER. Let me answer the Senator by saying that it has always been the rule in dispersal that a safe distance is 20 miles, and that is exactly what this is. So we come within all the specifications. I can see no reason for moving this agency.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to ask my distinguished friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland, whether if the argument of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is correct, based upon Mr. Val Peterson's knowledge as to where the first attack may strike, it would not be advisable to move the Capitol, the White House—

Mr. BUTLER. Everything.

Mr. WELKER. That is right—and move everything else out from under the canopy of the Capital of the United States?

Mr. BUTLER. Take it all out of Washington. It just does not make any sense. We have always lived up to the rule that a dispersal of 20 miles is sufficient.

Two or three years ago on the floor of the Senate the very eminent Senator from Florida had a dispersal bill which carried out that principle.

Mr. President, I will proceed with my statement. The denial of these funds should result in the postponement of plans to establish Civil Defense headquarters at Battle Creek until the next session of the Congress. During the interim period a comprehensive investigation should be made as to the proper location of all these important facilities.

During the era of savage thermonuclear weapons capable of destroying entire cities with one blast, members of the executive branch of the Government who are responsible for the management of our Civil Defense Administration cannot, in good conscience, do otherwise.

So I say, Mr. President, I make the point of order that this is a reappropriation of unexpended balances in last year's appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order has been made. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Chair wish to be advised on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I tried to persuade the Senator from Maryland at the beginning of his argument that the Senator from Michigan saw no reason why this point of order should not be sustained, and that the Senator from Michigan would have an amendment to offer, so that a point of order would not lie. I have no objection to the point of order, and believe that it

would be well at this particular time to sustain the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Reorganization Act of 1946, section 139, paragraph (c), states:

No general appropriation bill or amendment thereto shall be received or considered in either House if it contains a provision reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations.

Under that provision, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. I send to the desk an amendment on page 62, line 22, to strike out "\$11,000,000" and insert "\$11,350,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 62, in line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$11,000,000" and insert "\$11,350,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks on this particular amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to add \$350,000 to the civil defense appropriation for the purpose of the Civil Defense moving its headquarters from an apartment house in the city of Washington, where it is paying high rent, to a Federal facility owned by the United States Government in Battle Creek, Mich.

Mr. President, the Senators from Maryland will probably object to this on the ground that part of their facility is located at Olney, Md.

The Civil Defense Administration will be able to save \$217,000 a year by virtue of rents that will be saved when they are using a building owned by the United States Government.

Mr. President, it was not just decided to move this establishment to the State of Michigan. In fact, the United States Government went up to Indiantown Gap, Pa., and looked over a Federal facility there. They were determined to move out of the Washington area. So I am not here arguing for the State of Michigan, and that only the State of Michigan should receive this facility. It was the desire of the Civil Defense Administration to move away from the present location.

This is what the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations shows:

We are presently located in an apartment house building at 1930 Columbia Road in Washington, and that building should be returned to its owners.

That is in a high-rent district.

We are going to have to move. Personally, I think that we should get out of it. I think that it should be returned to the people who built it. The rent is high.

There are a number of considerations involved in moving. First, the Office of Defense Mobilization has said that as a security agency of the Government we should move 20 miles beyond a 10-mile circle drawn around the target area of Washington with the Capitol as the center. This would be 30 miles from the Capitol.

That is what the Office of Defense Mobilization says.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment. The Senator from Maryland was inclined to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BUTLER. For a particular purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. I read from the record in the testimony of Mr. Peterson:

We have at Olney, Md., at present a staff school, a rescue street, some other buildings, and a communications center.

Mr. TABER. How far out is that?

Mr. PETERSON. Nineteen air miles from the Capitol.

It should be 20 miles instead of 19.

Mr. President, Mr. Peterson testified in the Senate committee hearings. What did he say there was here at Olney, Md.?

We have at Olney, Md., a staff college and a rescue-training school, patterned after the English, who are the leaders in this field. We have trained many thousands of people from all over the United States.

As a matter of fact this training will take place out in the respective States instead of at Olney, or anywhere else—not even in Michigan—but these people are to be trained in the various States.

He continued:

Our first hope was that we could go out to Olney, erect a building, and locate our national headquarters there. However, Olney is 19 miles-plus from the Capitol, which we assume is the aiming point in Washington.

ODM, which has the responsibility for continuity of Government, has said that any industry which is building and expects to get tax benefits, must locate 10 miles beyond a perimeter drawn around an aiming point; in other words, 20 miles out in the country. They have said Government agencies should be at least 30 miles out. We ran into two problems in connection with Olney. ODM said it is not far enough. We cannot quarrel with them because we recognize these weapons are getting bigger and we want things dispersed.

POLICY ON NEW CONSTRUCTION

Secondly, the President said that so far as the executive branch was concerned, he did not want us or any other agency going in for new construction until and unless the agency had exhausted every possibility of moving into an existing Federal establishment standing idle. So we started to search all around this country for quarters into which we might go. That search has extended all over the area. The closest facility standing idle we could find which was adequate, is at Battle Creek, Mich. It is the Percy Jones General Hospital, formerly operated by the Kellogg people, and later taken over by the Army during the last war.

There is a million square feet of space standing idle there. It is the closest place to Washington we could find. We hope to move into that space. Those are the present plans.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I am not familiar with the State of Michigan, but I am wondering if Battle Creek is not a highly strategic area, in the event of an enemy attack, since I am informed giant indus-

tries are located either in or near Battle Creek, Mich.

Mr. FERGUSON. The city of Battle Creek is a town 125 miles from Detroit on the Michigan Central Railroad. Its industry is principally food, cereals. Therefore it is not a strategic area at all.

Mr. WELKER. It has no manufacturing, such as tanks and guns?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. WELKER. No heavy equipment, such as automobiles or anything of that nature?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know of any automobiles.

Mr. WELKER. Or parts for automobiles?

Mr. FERGUSON. There may be a few machine shops. It is not a strategic area at all.

Mr. WELKER. I still think somewhere in Idaho, or Denver, Colo., would be better.

Mr. FERGUSON. The communications center is at Denver, Colo.

Mr. WELKER. That is fine.

I have one further question, Mr. President. What does the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan have to say with respect to the allegation made by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] to the effect that in the event of an all-out emergency we would have to evacuate the Percy Jones Hospital? Where would they go? That is an important question in my mind.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is a very large building there, and the attack would have to be very serious before they would leave the Percy Jones Hospital. The Army has released the facility at Battle Creek and is agreeable to having the agency moved to Battle Creek, so they have given it up.

Mr. BUTLER. For how long?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. POTTER. I believe I can answer the question of my colleague from Idaho.

The Percy Jones building was not constructed as a hospital. It served as a hospital in World War II. It served very well as a hospital.

The Army has released it as a hospital. It is a beautiful, well-built structure, which is ideally suited for an office building. In case of another emergency there are many other buildings which would be suitable for a hospital.

This building was used as a hospital during the war, but it was not built as a hospital. Certainly we would not leave a building like that empty, waiting for another war to come along so that we could use it as a hospital. The Army has released it.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Obviously, there must have been some reason why this office building, or whatever it is, was used as a hospital in World War II. We are told that if another emergency arises conditions will be much more severe, and casualties will be exceedingly high. I am wondering why we cannot go out to some of the abandoned Air Force bases which

dot the Nation, which are now used entirely as bowling alleys for rats and skunks, where they could well do everything we can do at this so-called hospital there in Battle Creek.

Mr. POTTER. Does the Senator propose that we stockpile all the hospitals we had in World War II, awaiting another emergency?

Mr. WELKER. I think the situation is serious, since we are so alerted and must be so meticulous with respect to inches, feet, or miles away from the Nation's Capital, that we had better be alerted to this great danger we have all heard so much about. I say that the first thing we need is hospitals.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator not know that Val Peterson, the Administrator of this agency, has certified that Olney, Md., meets the minimum standard as to distance requirement?

Mr. FERGUSON. His testimony is just the opposite. I have read it to the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. I have a letter here which is not the opposite, and it is dated July 30. I received it August 2. I shall quote it:

While Olney meets the minimum distance standard—

So I do not know what he means.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me read his testimony.

Mr. BUTLER. I have just read from a letter.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall read his testimony:

Consistent with the need for dispersal and continuity of Government, FCDA, as you may know, is now in the process of moving our national office from Washington to Battle Creek, Mich., in order to get our agency and our people out of the critical target area of Washington. I am convinced that this Nation's Capital will be among the very first targets on an aggressor's list and unless we take this step to protect ourselves, we simply are not going to be around to do our jobs after the attack comes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator not know that this agency is an agency which must keep in close liaison with other departments of Government? We cannot run the civil defense of the United States in time of emergency from some building out in Battle Creek, one thousand miles away from this Capital. If we can do that, then let us move the Pentagon and all these other agencies away from Washington.

It sounds silly to me to select this one agency which is comfortably located in the lovely State of Maryland, and require it be moved to Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that it is beyond the imagination of the distinguished Senator that anything could possibly be moved from the great State of Maryland to the great State of Michigan.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator is certainly correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the feelings of the distinguished Senator. I have been in both States.

Mr. BUTLER. I will not even go so far as to limit it to Michigan. I say it is impossible for me to conceive of anything moving out of the great State of Maryland.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is right; I understand that.

If war should come, I suppose the Senator understands that the people would be moved out of the Pentagon Building. I do not know whether the Senator is familiar with the plans or not.

Mr. BUTLER. I suppose we would move out of the Capitol, too. Is there any distinction as between a United States Senator and the man who is operating the civilian defense agency? We would probably all move.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I now yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not a fact that the argument put forward by the distinguished Senator from Maryland relates to only a portion of the program?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. POTTER. For several years there has been an effort to find a suitable and adequate location to house the entire headquarters for the civil defense agencies. The Senator from Maryland is complaining because the training program which is located in Olney would be moved. The distinguished Senator from Michigan, and I, and the executive branch of the Government, which has recommended this change, are concerned about the entire civilian defense program. We are concerned about the headquarters being here where we are paying terrific rent. The object is to have a coordinated program in a rent-free facility, which will save the taxpayers of this country more than \$200,000 a year.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. It is like the tail wagging the dog.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Senator from Michigan know that within the past 2 months, not within the past 2 years, active negotiations have been in progress for the lease and purchase of the property at Olney? How could it have been within their contemplation for the last 2 or 3 years to move? If it has been, they have been fooling somebody in Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the junior Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. There are not merely 50 acres available in this tract. There are 243 acres. It is also possible to move the headquarters from Washington out to Olney, where the facility would be all on the same piece of land.

Mr. POTTER. Then it would be necessary to construct a new building.

Mr. BEALL. Yes; but it could be built under the lease-purchase arrangement, which would be cheaper than remodeling

the buildings in Battle Creek for this use. Under the law which Congress recently passed for lease-purchase agreements, under which the landlord will build, it actually would cost less to retain the facility at Olney. It is proposed to move the facility to Battle Creek and recondition a group of lovely old buildings and convert them for office use. They will have to be converted. By the time we were through remodeling them for these purposes, it would be much cheaper to buy an entire new building.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I have great love and affection for the Senator from Maryland, but it is possible to cite figures and statistics to support any argument. The facility at Battle Creek would not require any appreciable amount of money for remodeling for this program. It certainly would require much less than to build a new facility. Think of the waste. At Battle Creek we have a facility already built. We can utilize that facility rather than build a new one.

Mr. BEALL. That is what I am talking about at Olney. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. BEALL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator another question. Is it not provided in the agreements with the Army or the Veterans Hospital that, under instructions of the President, they will abandon Battle Creek for hospital purposes any time he says so? Is that not written into the agreement?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not so understand it. I am sure that the President of the United States—

Mr. BEALL. He can tell them to vacate it for hospital purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. He can vacate any building, for that matter.

Mr. BEALL. The Battle Creek medical resources at Mayo's, and everything else, I suppose.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; that is not correct. Mayo's is up at Rochester, Minn.

Let me make one further answer to the letter which the Senator claims he has from Mr. Peterson.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the Senator any doubt about it?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator said that I claim to have it. I do have it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Peterson stated to the committee:

We ran into two problems in connection with Olney. ODM said it is not far enough. We cannot quarrel with them because we recognize these weapons are getting bigger and we want things dispersed.

Mr. BUTLER. If ODM were asked if its own agency were far enough out, what would it say? Manifestly, it would say "No," because it is right in the heart of Washington. Why does it not move out?

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope we can get a vote favorable to the adding of \$350,000 to this item.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a point of order. Is this a matter of legislation on an appropriation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This amendment is for an increase in the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the Chair ruled that the demand for the yeas and nays was sufficiently seconded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarran
Anderson	Gore	McClellan
Barrett	Green	Millikin
Beall	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bowring	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bridges	Holland	Payne
Burke	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Reynolds
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clement	Kennedy	Smathers
Cooper	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Crippa	Kuchel	Stennis
Daniel	Lennon	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Magnuson	Upton
Ellender	Malone	Welker
Ervin	Mansfield	Young
Ferguson	Martin	
Fulbright	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. BUTLER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to speak a few sentences. These funds will enable the Civil Defense Administration to do that which it has started to do and has desired to do, namely, to move into a Federal building at Battle Creek, Mich., save \$270,000 a year on rental, and move an agency out of a critical area in Washington, where it is at present occupying a large apartment house on Columbia Road. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have been told that a number of years ago the late great publisher, William Randolph Hearst, became rather vitriolic during a campaign in which he was a candidate for public office in the State of New York. Finally the publisher issued an announcement in which he said, "If my opponent will stop telling lies about me, I promise to stop telling the truth about him."

Over the years, Mr. President, the State represented in part by the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and my own State of California have had a great many disputes. But I am happy to say that the same logic which appealed to the late publisher in New York also appealed to the people of California. Therefore, having applied that logic to the lawsuits which arose between Arizona and California, the Senators from those States are now in the happy situation of offering bills together on the floor of the Senate.

I wish that same philosophy might lend itself to an unfortunate cannibalistic situation, in which some of us now find ourselves torn by equal affection for those who live in Michigan, on the one hand, and those who live in Maryland, on the other hand.

Senators are in somewhat of a quandary about what to do. I hope that in the last analysis we can vote in the public interest.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am most happy that eventually California and Arizona are getting together. Now that they intend to introduce legislation pertaining to Arizona and California, I hope that they do not plan to take all of New Mexico's water, because every time we shed a tear or produce some kind of water in New Mexico, the States of California and Arizona seem to find some way to take it.

Mr. THYE. That is exactly why the two States have got together.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Chair advise the Senate as to what the Senate is being asked to vote upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 62, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$11,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$11,350,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. MANSFIELD, when his name was called, voted "present."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the junior Senator from Montana is out of order, he not having voted when his name was called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator will have to withhold his point of order until the call of the roll is completed.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, rule XII, paragraph 2, provides as follows:

When a Senator declines to vote on call of his name, he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor, and having assigned them, the Presiding Officer shall submit the question to the Senate: "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?" which shall be decided with-

out debate; and these proceedings shall be had after the rollcall and before the result is announced; and any further proceedings in reference thereto shall be after such announcement.

Mr. President, my reason for voting "present" is that it looks to me as if the vote on the amendment is a matter purely between Republican Senators from two States. So, I think in the interest of harmony and in the interest of bipartisanship, the best thing I can do is vote "present."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon insist that the Senator from Montana vote?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon states that the Senator from Montana must either be excused from voting or must vote after he assigns his reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the Senator from Montana, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting? [Putting the question.]

Several Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is in doubt. The Chair will call for a division.

All those in favor, raise their hands.

SEVERAL SENATORS. In favor of what?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In favor of excusing the Senator from Montana from voting.

Senators will please hold their hands up until they are counted.

The Chair will ask Senators in favor of excusing the Senator from Montana from voting to rise.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. In favor of excusing the Senator from Montana from voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In favor of excusing the Senator from Montana from voting. All those opposed, stand.

The "nays" have it, and the Chair rules that the Senator from Montana is required to vote.

The CHIEF CLERK. Mr. MANSFIELD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In the interest of economy, I vote "nay." [Laughter.]

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Alabama

[Mr. HILL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	Fulbright	Potter
Bowring	Hayden	Purtell
Bricker	Hendrickson	Reynolds
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltionstall
Burke	Ives	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Jackson	Stennis
Case	Knowland	Thye
Cordon	Kuchel	Upton
Dworshak	Mundt	Young
Ferguson	Payne	

NAYS—44

Anderson	Gore	Martin
Barrett	Green	Maybank
Beall	Hennings	McCarran
Bennett	Holland	McClellan
Butler	Humphrey	Millikin
Capehart	Jenner	Monroney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Cooper	Kennedy	Robertson
Crippa	Kerr	Russell
Daniel	Lennon	Smathers
Douglas	Long	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Symington
Ervin	Malone	Welker
Goldwater	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—23

Bush	Gillette	Murray
Byrd	Hill	Neely
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Duff	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Kilgore	Watkins
Flanders	Langer	Wiley
Frear	Lehman	Williams
George	McCarthy	

So Mr. FERGUSON's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Ferguson amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the senior Senator from Maryland be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Maryland to lay on the table the motion of the senior Senator from Maryland.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I address an inquiry to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and ask him how he interprets the action of the Senate in this instance. Does not the chairman of the committee believe that the agency is now deterred from leaving the vicinity of the Capital?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know that I can interpret the action of the Senate any better than the Senate itself has interpreted its action when a moment ago it voted to deny funds for the moving of the agency. Apparently the sense of the Senate was very obvious.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I direct the attention of the Senate to the committee amendment on page 25 of the bill, and I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. Inasmuch as the House of Representatives incorporated general legislation in the appropriation bill, the Senate would have the right, would it not, to amend that legislation if the amendment were germane?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the statement of the Senator from Maryland is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. So that the parliamentary situation may be entirely clear, I understand that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire intends to protect the committee, and that in doing so he intends to resist a point of order which I may raise on the very question I have just propounded to the Chair. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that the chairman of the committee could do nothing else, in representing the committee, than to call attention to the germaneness of the question if the point of order is raised.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. Is the Senator from Maryland correct in believing that if a point of order is now made, it will cut off debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When a point of order is raised, the Chair will rule, unless the question of germaneness is raised, in which case the Chair will submit the question to the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. It is not my desire to detain the Senate, and I shall make a very brief explanation of my reasons for making the point of order.

Mr. President, the appropriation bill, as amended by the Senate Appropriations Committee, authorizes and appropriates supplemental funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be used, in part, to meet the cost of transferring some 450 employees of the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance from Baltimore to Washington.

After a careful study of the proposal, it is my considered opinion that the transfer of those employees would be completely antagonistic to every policy of economy and efficiency and to the best interests of both the Government and the employees involved.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recently announced plans for the erection of a new building in Baltimore to house the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance. The employees subject to this transfer to Washington are those making up the headquarters staff of this Bureau, which, as the name "headquarters staff" implies, is composed of the technicians and professional personnel which supervise the day-by-day functions of the Bureau.

Although the plans originally envisioned that the headquarters staff would remain in Baltimore with the rest of the Bureau employees, and the members involved were so advised on numerous occasions, it was announced on May 11 of

this year that the headquarters staff would be transferred to Washington.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. To what part of the bill is the Senator now addressing himself?

Mr. BUTLER. I refer to page 25, line 9 to 23.

In a recent letter to the President with reference to this proposed transfer, I stated several of the more substantial reasons why these employees should remain in Baltimore, which are as follows:

First, efficiency and economy of operation: As previously emphasized, the members of the headquarters staff obviously must work closely with the other members of the Bureau and to execute their function from Washington would be extremely difficult, more costly, and inefficient. Furthermore, no persuasive reason, from an administrative or executive standpoint, seems to exist for having the headquarters staff in Washington.

Second, extreme hardship to the 450 employees involved: These employees are settled residents of Baltimore and the surrounding area.

Many have bought homes on the strength of prior announcements by officials of the Social Security Administration that "all Bureau employees" would be covered "under one roof in the Baltimore area." The proposed move to Washington would result in the forced sale of their homes and, in many instances, the splitting of families, inasmuch as many wives or husbands of employees work in other divisions of the Bureau or in private industry in Baltimore.

The move would thus demoralize the personnel of this Bureau. It is estimated that at least one-third of the trained staff would resign, if forced to transfer. Furthermore, a sizable portion of the stenographic personnel would refuse to move to Washington; and it would be difficult to replace this personnel in the latter city under present employment conditions, and at rates paid stenographic help in Baltimore.

Third, Space problems would result both in Baltimore and in Washington. At the present time the headquarters staff is located in the Equitable Building, in Baltimore, and requires approximately 55,000 square feet of space.

At the present time the Government has a lease on this space at the rate of \$2.30 per foot per annum, with the lease on this space expiring as follows: one-third on May 31, 1955; one-third on November 30, 1955; and one-third on May 31, 1956. I am told that the present liability under the lease amounts to approximately \$160,000, which the Government would probably lose if the move should take place in August, as scheduled.

Regarding space in Washington, it is assumed that the personnel would be moved into the main headquarters building of the Department, on Independence Avenue. However, it is my

understanding that only 20,000 square feet of space is available in that building, which would mean that the Department would have to acquire additional space in Washington, at extra cost.

Fourth, The move would be contrary to the theory of decentralization of Government operation. For economic and defense purposes, it has been the policy and constant effort of the executive branch of the Government to decentralize Government operation to the greatest extent possible. The move of this personnel to Washington would be contrary to this theory in the most extreme sense.

Fifth, Last, in no event is it now the time for such a move. House bill 9366, the social-security expansion bill, will undoubtedly be approved in the very near future by Congress. The headquarters staff, the personnel subject to this move, will have the task of working out new administrative procedures for the entire country resulting from this implementation of the social-security program. It is essential that the efficiency and the morale of this personnel be retained under all circumstances.

Several weeks ago I advised the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the basis upon which I objected to the proposed transfer, and I set forth the reasons I have just stated. Inasmuch as I have not received a detailed rebuttal of the objections, it must be assumed that the Department has no answer to them. In any event, I firmly believe that the factors I have stated, in themselves, manifest the impropriety of the proposal and are not subject to serious challenge.

This appropriation bill as passed by the House of Representatives provided that—

None of the funds available to the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance shall be used to pay any costs, direct or indirect, of moving any group of employees of the Bureau from Baltimore, Md., to Washington, D. C.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended that the above provision be amended so as to read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

The amounts made available under this head for the fiscal year 1955 shall be available for the payment of special allowances to those employees of the Department whose headquarters are relocated from Baltimore, Md., to Washington, D. C., at \$9 per day after arrival at Washington, D. C., for 6 days for employees, plus \$4.50 per day additional for 6 days for each member of immediate families of employees.

No prior authorization of the per diem allowances referred to in the Senate amendment has been made by Congress. The Senate committee amendment to the bill therefore constitutes substantive legislation on an appropriation bill, and is subject to a point of order insofar as it is not germane to the subject matter.

Mr. President, for the reasons just stated, I therefore raise the point of order with respect to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in order to carry out the recommendations of

the committee, I must insist that the committee amendment is germane.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief clarifying statement in connection with this question.

This division consists of approximately 450 employees. They were what might be termed the headquarters staff. The staff was moved to Baltimore in 1941, at the outbreak of the war, when space in Washington, D. C., was at a premium. In view of that move, the plan has always been to have the group return to Washington as soon as conditions returned to normal, following the end of the war.

The facts are that buildings were erected in Washington to house the OASI; and those buildings are now occupied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There is no reason or justification for denying to the employees involved proper compensation for the expense of disposing of their homes in Baltimore and coming to Washington, D. C., and acquiring homes in Washington, D. C.

That is all that is involved in the committee amendment that is objected to by the Senator from Maryland. The objection is made simply on the basis that the committee amendment states that the employees are to receive \$9 a day for 6 days, and each dependent in the member of the family of such employee is to receive \$4.50 a day for 6 days. The fact is that many of the employees have already disposed of their homes in Baltimore.

So the Senator from Maryland cannot stop the transfer. If he objects to the amendment, an injustice will be committed against the employees involved, because they will not be allowed the \$9 a day for the number of days involved, and thus will not be allowed to receive reimbursement for the cost of making the move or transfer.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. THYE. Not at the moment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). The Chair must remind the Senator from Minnesota that, under rule XX, a point of order is not debatable.

The Chair was willing to indulge the Senator from Minnesota for a few moments. If the Senator from Minnesota can complete his remarks in a few moments more, the Chair will indulge him to that extent, after which there will be no further remarks.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I merely wish to say that certain of the employees have acquired new homes in Washington, after having disposed of their old homes in Baltimore. Nothing that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] can do can prevent the transfer of this division, because it is in the process of making the transfer.

If the Senator from Maryland objects, he will make it impossible for the employees to receive the compensation the committee has seen fit to vote to have them allowed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be al-

lowed to proceed for half a minute, to answer the statement just made by the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Inasmuch as the Chair has indulged the Senator from Minnesota, the Chair is willing to indulge the Senator from Maryland, if he will confine his remarks to a few moments.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I have no information similar to that just recited by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. In all the extensive hearings, there is not one word about why the move is to be made, or to show that any employee has sold a house or has bought a house. I defy any Senator to find in the hearings one word which would justify the move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must insist—

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must insist on the application of rule XVI, which provides, in effect, that when a question of the germaneness or relevancy of an amendment is raised, it is the duty of the Presiding Officer, under rule XVI, paragraph 4, to submit the matter to the Senate for its determination; and the submission of the question to the Senate takes priority over a point of order that the amendment is general legislation.

Under rule XVI, if a question of germaneness is raised, the Chair is required to submit the question to the Senate.

The question is: Is it the sense of the Senate that the committee amendment, on page 25, in lines 14 to 23, inclusive, is germane to the language of the bill, as passed by the House, which would be stricken out by the committee amendment? [Putting the question.]

The "noes" have it.

The Senate having voted that the amendment is not germane, the amendment is not in order.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, Mr. President, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not completed his ruling.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I request a division.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Chair has not announced his ruling—

Mr. BUTLER. He has announced it. Mr. THYE. Then the question is open. If he has, then I wish to be recognized.

Mr. BUTLER. Has not the Chair announced the decision?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that the Chair has already announced the result of the vote.

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Then, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. THYE. I must invite the attention of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] to the fact that he waved this committee hearing record about, and said there was not a line in it about this transfer. Therefore, I must respectfully call to the Senator's attention the language on page 380. Will he please read it?

Mr. BUTLER. I did not make such a statement. The Senator said there was not one word in these hearings in the way of a reason for making this move, or that anyone had sold a house or had bought another house in Washington. I defy the Senator to find it.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I insist upon the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I send to the desk an amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I thought I was recognized. I had a reply to make to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The floor was yielded, and the Chair recognized—

Mr. THYE. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Minnesota was still on his feet, and was asking to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] had called for the regular order, and the Chair stated that there was a demand for the regular order, and announced the regular order. The bill is open to further amendment. A further amendment has been offered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I was still on my feet trying to be recognized, and we are still on the bill. Therefore, I think that I have the right—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield, with the understanding that I will be recognized thereafter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I read from the hearings on page 380:

Senator THYE. In other words, you have an item here to include \$9 a day for 6 days for the employees after they arrive in Washington. And the \$4.50 for each member of the immediate family.

What is that for?

Mr. TRAMBURG. That is to ease the burden of the transfer cost that the family has.

Senator THYE. From Baltimore to Washington?

Mr. TRAMBURG. From Baltimore to Washington.

Senator THYE. You mean they are moving down here and it is going to be 6 days before they settle themselves in their own respective homes?

Mr. TRAMBURG. I wouldn't say it would be, Mr. Chairman. It is an attempt to assist the employee when you are uprooting him from his present living quarters and moving to another city.

Senator THYE. You have never done this before?

Mr. TRAMBURG. Sir, I can't answer that.

Senator THYE. The statement here says not.

Mr. TRAMBURG. I have just been informed when these people moved out due to the war space situation here that this is the same situation that prevailed then. The movement was then from Washington to Baltimore during the war years. This involves only the headquarters staff, 450 of the approximately 14,000 employees in the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

Senator HAYDEN. They were compensated when they were moved from Washington to Baltimore?

Mr. President, that is all I wanted to call to the attention of the Senate. I did not wish to be informed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] that there was nothing in this record on the subject, because there was something in it. That is all I was trying to obtain recognition for. I merely want the record to be clear.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. I sent my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 33, line 21, after the word "and", it is proposed to insert the words "for emergency rehabilitation of the."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that the Senator from New Hampshire will take that amendment to conference.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, line 16, after the word "amended", it is proposed to strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$5 million."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely wish to remind the Senate that only a short while ago we passed a bill extending the Water Facilities Act to all the 31 States in what is called the western and Pacific coast area.

It seems to me that the sum of \$5 million would enable this program to get properly under way. In the 31 States, they must have this \$5 million, which is a loan program, and the interest rates will be increased to 4 percent. If the money is not loaned, it will not be used, of course. It is not a giveaway or a grant program at all. Everyone is now particularly conscious of the evil effects of the drought in all the States of this area, including my own State and all of the Midwest.

The House today passed a special emergency relief bill authorizing further aid. We appropriated and made available as much as \$100 million last year for the relief of States suffering from the drought. This program is designed for the long pull and to prevent the disastrous effect of the drought in many places where water is available. I think it is a very sound business proposition, and I hope the committee will accept the amendment. I hope the House and

Senate will pass it. If the committee feels that it needs some support in this matter—

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this particular amendment relates to new legislation which has just been enacted, as the distinguished Senator has said. The committee, after hearing the evidence presented, and deliberating on it, felt that \$3,500,000 was an adequate sum to initiate this program, and all that could be used properly at this time.

This is a matter of judgment, let me say to the Senator from Arkansas. Perhaps \$5 million is the correct amount; perhaps it should be \$4 million, perhaps \$3 million. The committee arrived at the figure of \$3,500,000 as a proper figure. But it is just a question of judgment, as to how soon this program will be in operation, and how it will be used. That is not a hard and fast figure, but the committee felt that it was a reasonable determination.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator think that, under the extremely serious conditions now existing in regard to the drought, in addition to the actual use of this money it would be of benefit psychologically to the people in all these 31 States to know that until there is a possibility of doing something about the water supply, and especially in view of the fact that this is a loan program—and the Senator, I believe, will agree that these loans have worked out very well economically and the program has been very successful in the past in this restricted area of 17 Western States—it would be well to get this program under way? I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will let this program get under way. Once it is going, I think we would gain more experience; but \$5 million is not very much for 31 States.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire, acting on his own initiative, after talking briefly with other members of the committee, will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF
THE UNITED STATES

Administrative expenses (Korean claims)

For expenses necessary to enable the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to carry out the provisions of the amendments of 1954 to the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 2004), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriate

tion, \$100,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 9390, 83d Congress.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I will take just about 1 minute to explain the amendment. This matter came to the committee's attention after we closed our hearings on the bill. A bill recently passed by Congress set up a War Claims Commission for Korean veterans who were held prisoner of war by either the Chinese Communists or the North Korean Communists. Such a prisoner of war does not come under the definition established by the Geneva Convention. Therefore, such prisoners of war do not come under the provisions of the regular War Claims Act. It was, therefore, necessary to set up a special War Claims Commission so that American prisoners of war who were held by either the Chinese Communists or the North Korean Communists and who suffered as a result of such imprisonment, and in some cases suffered atrocities, may have the right to submit war claims.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does this matter have any relation to the Trading With the Enemy Act?

Mr. BRIDGES. So far as the Senator from New Hampshire knows, it has not, except that some money eventually coming from the claims may come under the provisions of that act. That is the only connection, namely, that after the commission is set up and the claims are judged to be fair claims, the money with which to pay the claims would come from that source. However, this matter is not directly concerned with the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It is not related at all to the Dirksen bill or to the Hendrickson-Smith-Ives bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. I want to be entirely fair with the Senator from New Jersey, because the Senator from New Hampshire has not heard any testimony on this matter. It is one of those last minute matters that were submitted to the committee. It seemed to us to be very laudable, because the Korean war veterans should have the same means and methods of adjusting their claims as other war veterans. Certainly there is no group of people in America who deserve more attention from our country than the group of American war veterans who suffered atrocities or cruelties or other injury at the hands of the Communists in the Korean prisoner of war camps. Aside from that the Senator from New Hampshire cannot furnish more information.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May we have the amendment read again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF
THE UNITED STATES

Administrative expenses (Korean claims)

For expenses necessary to enable the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to carry out the provisions of the amendments of

1954 to the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 2004), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$100,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 9390, 83d Congress.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

MR. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish at this time to call to the attention of the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the Senate the provisions of section 906, subsection (b) of section 404 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and the amendment thereto.

The chairman of the committee has served notice, according to the rules of the Senate, this being legislation on an appropriation bill, that he will submit the question to a vote of the Senate. I merely wish to call to the attention of the chairman of the committee the fact that this committee amendment is entirely inconsistent with the report of the committee itself, and that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now has before it 4 or 5 bills, one of which has been passed by the Senate, which are entirely contrary to the spirit of that section of the appropriation bill.

The section was included in the last appropriation bill, and the Senator from Ohio objected to it at that time, and assured the Senator from New Hampshire that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had the subject under consideration, which it had at that time.

There are two or three other bills before the committee. If the purposes of the amendment are carried out, it will be in opposition to the position taken by most of the departments of Government which have reported to our committee and testified against that principle.

As the report of the committee states, the transportation facilities of the country require that there be a stabilization of rates, not only for Government services, but for all other services, as well. Because of the inconsistency in this amendment with the report of the committee and the other provisions of the bill, and because it cuts across the terms of the bills reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one of which has been passed by the Senate and sent to the House for action, and because the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is further considering similar bills in regard to all forms of transportation, not only by air but by water and all means of transportation, I wonder whether the chairman would not be willing to take out that provision at this time.

MR. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio state at what page of the bill the item occurs?

MR. BRICKER. At page 49. The item reads as follows:

Sec. 906. Subsection (b) of section 404 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 993; 49 U. S. C. 484 (b)) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "*Provided*, That nothing in this or any other act shall prevent the carriage, storage, or

handling of property free or at reduced rates for the Department of Defense, or the transportation of persons free or at reduced rates for the Department of Defense on a space available basis on scheduled service."

That includes all kinds of service. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has already reported to the floor several bills, or at least two bills. I shall be glad to give the numbers of the bills to the Senate. They are Senate bill 904, Senate bill 3049, and House bill 8029. We have had reports from the departments of Government on all of the bills, and the departments are opposed to the principle set out in the provision I have read. I should like to read, for the information of the Senate from the report on this bill itself, at page 40 of the report:

It has long been recognized that transportation charges may be unreasonable because of being too low, and any policy of bargaining for rates or playing one carrier off against another with the primary objective of getting the lowest possible transportation rate without regard to the consequences for the carrier is promotive of destructive competitive practices and fosters unsound economic conditions in transportation contrary to the national transportation policy.

Accordingly, all Government agencies and executive departments are admonished to pay full heed to the national transportation policy in their dealings with carriers.

Consistent with that pronouncement on the part of the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has already reported to the floor of the Senate one bill, and is considering 2 or 3 other bills.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio desire to make a point of order against that provision in the bill?

MR. BRICKER. Yes; I wish to make a point of order against it. However, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has already notified the Senate that he would submit the legislative question to the Senate.

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I recognize that this is legislation and it would be subject to a point of order. Members of the committee who favored the insertion of the amendment believed it would allow the Department of Defense to take advantage of free space on return trips and would result in the saving of money. I recognize that it is legislation. So long as the point is raised by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire will not press it.

MR. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, and assure him the committee will continue its consideration of these bills.

MR. BRIDGES. I send to the desk another amendment, and ask that it be stated.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

All functions, duties, and authority of the Architect of the Capitol with respect to the legislative garage, together with any funds, contracts, authorizations, appropriations, and records of the Architect of the Capitol which are primarily related to and necessary

for, the exercise of such functions, duties, and authority, are transferred to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and shall be performed, exercised, and administered by him in accordance with the provisions of law relating to the control, supervision, and care of the legislative garage. The employees engaged in the care and maintenance of such garage are transferred to the jurisdiction of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate without any reduction in compensation as a result of such transfer.

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee authorized and directed the Senator from New Hampshire to offer this amendment for the consideration of the Senate. Now it is for the Senate to decide whether or not it wants it. It will require only a minute to explain the amendment.

The Senate garage is used some by House Members, but primarily by the Senate. It is under the control of the Architect of the Capitol.

There have been various complaints coming to legislative bodies by many Senators on both sides of the aisle relative to the operation of the Senate garage. There are Senators whose cars have been damaged. They have not been able to find the person responsible for such damage. In recent days or weeks, 3 cars have been stolen from the Senate garage. One of them happens to be the car belonging to the Clerk of the House, one of them is the car of the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the other belongs to the staff of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PORTER].

I do not know how the House will feel concerning an amendment of this kind, because it has at least an interest in the so-called Senate garage, but the committee felt the amendment should be offered for the consideration of the Senate and at least it should be taken to the conference and discussed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The amendment was agreed to.

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$300,000; and the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1955, on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased from "\$220,000" to "\$265,000."

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered will provide an additional sum of \$300,000 to the appropriation for the Federal Power Commission in accordance with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and the President.

On June 7, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States held that producers of natural gas who transport natural gas in interstate commerce or who sell natural gas in interstate commerce for

resale, are subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act. The case is Phillips Petroleum Co., petitioner, against State of Wisconsin, et al., known as the Phillips case.

Prior to June 7 the Commission had considered producers and gatherers of natural gas as not within the purview of the Natural Gas Act, and the Commission had confined its regulation of the natural gas industry pretty largely to the pipeline companies. In its original budget estimate for the year ended June 30, 1955, the Commission estimated that only 120 natural gas companies were subject to its jurisdiction under the Natural Gas Act. These 120 companies were, on the whole, pipeline companies.

It is now estimated that about 4,000 additional natural gas companies, as defined in the Natural Gas Act, are subject to the Commission's regulatory authority. The Commission has asked for a very modest sum, \$300,000, for the current fiscal year to permit it to discharge its minimum responsibilities and duties with respect to these additional companies.

The sum of \$300,000 which the Commission requests is not for the purpose of engaging in wholesale investigations of producers and gatherers. Quite obviously this is so because the sum is too small to finance a large investigation. As I understand it, the Commission does not contemplate initiating in the current fiscal year investigations of producers and gatherers which are subject to the provisions of the Natural Gas Act except in special or unusual situations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Commission does not contemplate making an investigation, then why is the Senator asking for \$300,000 additional before the court actually acts on the motion for rehearing?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will tell the Senator in the next paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Was this \$300,000 proposal considered by the committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What action was taken by the committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. The action of the committee was to not put it in.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. How many members of the committee voted for it? Does the Senator recall?

Mr. FERGUSON. I was not at the first hearing. I moved for reconsideration, and lost.

Mr. MAYBANK. It would be fair to say that, as I recall—I stand to be corrected if I am wrong—there was only one vote for it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The vote of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MAYBANK. No. At the first hearing.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not familiar with the vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. On reconsideration, unless I am mistaken—

Mr. FERGUSON. On the reconsideration, I know.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Michigan—I speak most respectfully because I understand his trouble—was the only one who voted for it.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I said the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was 15 to 1, as I understand.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator from New Hampshire inform us as to the vote?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it was 15 to 1.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Commission needs the money requested to process rate schedules and applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity which must be filed with the Commission by this large number of producers and gatherers transporting or selling gas at wholesale in interstate commerce. So it will need the money for a staff of 60 employees, plus an average of 45 others, as is indicated in the testimony.

Mr. President, it is true that a motion for a rehearing has been filed and, as this decision came at the close of the June term, June 7, there was no time for the granting or denial of the motion for rehearing, but when an application was made for a stay, it was denied. Therefore, the law today is as the decision was rendered in the case.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We understand that the law is as announced by the Senator from Michigan. The justifications for this item were presented before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. After the justifications were presented to the committee, only one Senator stood for the justifications. Is that not correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. That is the way the record now stands.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The record now stands that the Committee on Appropriations turned it down completely, and that only 1 man out of the entire 21 voted for the justification.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan also recalls that the item in relation to the moving of the civilian defense agency was decided by the committee unanimously, and yet the Senate of the United States decided otherwise.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are merely trying to explain the situation for the benefit of the Senators who are not members of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think this matter is important. The explanation will take the Senator from Michigan only a few minutes, if the Senate will bear with him. I think the Record ought to be clear.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURKE. I ask the Senator from Michigan if it is not true that the Supreme Court of the United States in its decision in the Phillips Petroleum case

laid down the law of the land, which is the law today?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BURKE. And if the Senate of the United States should deny this appropriation it would in effect nullify the decision of the Supreme Court, solely because a motion for rehearing is now pending?

Mr. FERGUSON. That would be correct. It is the law. Whether we like it or not, it is the law, because no stay was granted.

The Commission has very little control over the additional workload which will result from the recent interpretation of the Natural Gas Act.

If the Commission does not have the staff required to process the rate schedules and other matters which will come to it as a result of the Phillips decision, confusion in a wide scale will most certainly result. This is so because rates for the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale are not lawful unless filed with the Commission, and because of the requirement that an additional 4,000 companies obtain certificates of public convenience and necessity.

Mr. President, this Commission will be able to raise rates as well as lower rates, because that is within its power.

Mr. President, on the 7th day of June, or shortly thereafter, a stay was granted, so that no rates can be raised unless the Commission can look into them; and we are asking for this money to be used for that purpose.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURKE. As a result, if the Senate denies this item it will prevent the Commission from either raising or lowering rates?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

It is estimated that more than 5,000 rate schedules or contracts must be filed with the Commission in order to establish their legality. Moreover, no change in jurisdictional rates can be achieved without the filing of the change with the Commission. These changes must be reviewed by the Commission for the purpose of determining their reasonableness. The Commission can suspend rate changes if it deems such action to be in the public interest. Obviously, if the Commission does not have the staff to analyze the rate changes it will have no recourse but to suspension.

Thus if the Commission cannot proceed in an orderly manner with respect to rate schedules and contracts, it must be obvious that great confusion will prevail and that untold litigation concerning the lawfulness of charges will ensue.

Mr. President, our cities and people who are consumers are concerned over this matter, and many lawsuits may result unless they can proceed and get their certificates, as is required by law.

Altogether, it would represent a very unwholesome situation. In short, the failure of the Commission to have an adequate staff to process rate filings would lead to great confusion to the detriment of all concerned—the producer, the pipeline company, and the consumer.

I would like to reiterate that the Commission does not intend, as they tell me, to launch a wide-scale investigation of those persons who, as a result of the Phillips decision, are now known to be subject to its jurisdiction. Rather, the Commission plans to proceed slowly in this matter by confining its activities in the current year largely to the processing of those rate schedules, applications, and documents which must be filed with it.

The Commission, in line with this plan, has issued order No. 174, which requires the producers and gatherers subject to its jurisdiction to file the rate schedules which were in effect on June 7, 1954, the date of the Phillips decision. The acceptance of such rate schedules or contracts would, of course, establish the lawfulness thereof.

The foregoing order further provides the mechanics of filing changes in rates after that date which, under the law, must be filed with the Commission.

Thus the Commission, taking a very practical view, has considered June 7, 1954, as the cutting-off date. The rates prevailing on June 7, 1954, will be maintained in status quo at least until interested parties seek a change. The new natural-gas companies may seek changes in the rates by filing appropriate notices with the Commission. The Commission, as previously stated, will analyze such changes and sanction them where appropriate and suspend them where they are not justified. If the Commission does not have a staff to make a study for the justification of the changes, it will have no recourse but to suspend them.

It is of vital importance to all of those affected by the Natural Gas Act, those who produce, transport, and sell in interstate commerce as well as the many millions of consumers, that the Natural Gas Act be administered in an orderly and competent manner and that chaos and confusion be avoided. If the Commission fails to take any action whatsoever in this matter, to administer the Natural Gas Act in accordance with the interpretation of the Supreme Court, certainly confusion cannot fail but be the result. This confusion would permeate the entire industry.

Any suggestion that producers and gatherers would gain by the failure of the Commission to administer the law, as interpreted by the Court, is completely in error, in my opinion. This is so because if producers and gatherers do not comply with the law or if the Commission does not have the means of processing filings made by producers and gatherers in compliance with the law, the legality of the transportation and sale in interstate commerce by such producers and gatherers would, to say the least, be in a grave state of legal and practical uncertainty.

The sum of \$300,000 is a most modest sum for the duties involved. Clearly it is the bare bones amount needed to process those matters which will come to the Commission as a result of the Phillips case. It is a small cost to avoid the chaos in the natural-gas industry which will result if the Commission does not have the minimum staff needed to discharge its enlarged responsibilities.

As I said, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended that this appropriation of \$300,000 be granted, and I hope the Senate will agree to this amendment in order to permit the Federal Power Commission to carry out its duties in the public interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand the amendment, it is directed toward the one purpose of fulfilling the legal doctrine or the court order which was handed down, so that equity will be had for both those who are producers and sellers of natural gas, at the producer and wholesale level, and also that consumers of such gas.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Without this money the Federal Power Commission will be literally hamstrung or be in a straitjacket of inability to hold hearings, and to make proper findings of fact, for the purpose of establishing rates, both for the consumer and for the producer?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. They will be unable to issue certificates because they would not have the manpower to do it, without this sum of money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So no matter how we look at it, even from the producers' viewpoint, in view of the June 7 cutoff date, if there is to be any adjustment in rates, either up or down, this appropriation is necessary.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the consumers are to have any possibility of knowing what their natural-gas rates will be for a period of time, rather than on an interim basis, we must make this appropriation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that is correct.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, just 1 minute.

The Committee on Appropriations heard the evidence and took the position that because a final decision had not been made on this matter, because a rehearing before the court had not been had and would not be had until late fall, there was no need at this time for granting the appropriation. For that reason the committee voted overwhelmingly against recommending the \$300,000 appropriation.

As chairman of the committee, I must oppose the amendment.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BURKE. May I ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether the Supreme Court has issued a stay in the Phillips Petroleum case?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it has not.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I offer on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following section:

SEC. —. There are authorized to be appropriated for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, for the purpose of completing inventories, surveys, and plans authorized under the provisions of title I of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, such sums as may be necessary for such purpose and are not in excess of the amount which was covered into the Treasury under the provisions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954, as the balance of the amount previously appropriated for the purposes of such title I.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, under title I of Public Law 815 of 1950, all States were given certain funds in order to survey school construction needs. Five States have not completed the survey, namely, Kansas, Massachusetts, New Jersey, West Virginia, and North Carolina. All other States have completed their surveys. For various reasons the five States I named were unable to do so.

The amendment which I have offered would give the five States I have named until June 1955 to complete their surveys.

As there is about to be reported a \$150 million emergency construction bill for fiscal years 1955 and 1956, it seems to me most important that the five States be allowed to complete inventories of their construction needs. It is for that reason that I offer the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the amendment refer to Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, which set up a \$5 million fund for a nationwide survey?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. The States I have named would require the following amounts in order to complete their surveys:

Kansas, \$22,865.
Massachusetts, \$30,554.
New Jersey, \$57,000.
West Virginia, \$16,031.
North Carolina, \$23,904.

All other States have completed their surveys. The amendment would give the five States I have named until June 1955 to complete their surveys.

The proposal would not require any additional funds. The States would have received the money, except that they were not able to complete their surveys.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The 81st Congress, by virtue of Public Law 815, did set up a fund of \$5 million for the original survey, but those States did not expend

the money to which they were entitled. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, the date for the completion of the surveys has expired. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is right. The date expired in June of this year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And the Senator from Massachusetts is merely asking that the funds which were unexpended be made available in order that those States which did not complete their surveys may do so. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very much interested in the proposal, because it was my privilege to be the sponsor of Public Law 815. I think the survey revealed interesting facts regarding school construction needs. I think the Senator from Massachusetts is correct. If we are to legislate in that field, we ought to have the most competent basis for a study of school needs. That cannot be done if five States have not had an opportunity to complete their surveys.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is about to report a bill providing for an expenditure of \$150 million in that field. So a survey is a preliminary requisite.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for offering the amendment. I wish to associate myself with the remarks he has made. I think the amendment is a very worthy one, and I hope the Senate will agree to it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, much as I should like to agree with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts—

Mr. KENNEDY. The senior Senator from Massachusetts has joined me.

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment involves legislation on an appropriation bill. It could not be any more so. Although the objective of the amendment is worthy, and although there may be some excellent reason for the failure of the named States to complete their surveys within the specified date, the only thing I can do, because of the prior action of the committee, and because the amendment involves legislation on an appropriation bill, is to make a point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire withhold his point of order?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I withhold my point of order so that the Senator from Minnesota may ask a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations been in the position of having to resist all legislative items in the appropriation bill, or has he on occasion accepted them?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly I have not resisted all such requests, but the amendment proposes legislation. I do not wish to become involved in this particular field, but, in fairness, I would have to be opposed to the amendment. I think the easiest way to do it is to make

a point of order. I commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and his colleagues for offering the amendment. I do not at all blame them for doing so. I might say that all other matters involving legislation which were considered were first considered by the committee.

The committee then directed the chairman to authorize them and notice was given. I do not wish to be critical of what the Senator from Massachusetts is doing. Representing his great State, as he does, I do not blame him or the Senator from New Jersey for taking the position they have taken, but it is legislation they seek and it should be enacted in another manner.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Because the amendment involves legislation, that fact would not bar the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire from taking it to conference, would it?

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must sustain the point of order.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the item appearing on page 8 of the bill, beginning on line 14, and extending to line 2 on page 9?

Mr. BRIDGES. The chairman of the Senate Office Building Commission is present in the Chamber, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL]. I think perhaps he can explain the item better than can the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, this question of a new Senate Office Building is not new to the Senate. It has been discussed for many years. In 1948 there was an authorization for the expenditure of \$20,600,000 by the Senate. I believe at that time the vote to proceed with the building was 42 to 35. Three Senators indicated a desire to see the building constructed, and would have voted for it except for the Korean situation at that time.

The Commission has made a very complete study of the need for a new Senate Office Building. I should like to read some figures revealed in the report.

When the plans for the New Senate Office Building were approved in 1949, the total number of employees on Senators' office staffs was 866, and the total number of committee employees was 212. I call attention to the fact that that was a year after the authorization to proceed with the erection of a building at a cost of \$20,600,000.

Today, Senators' office staffs have increased from 866 to 1,092 employees, and committee staffs have increased from 212 to 413 employees—a total increase of 427 employees, or nearly a 50-percent increase in such personnel since the New Senate Office Building was authorized in 1949.

When it is considered that the national population has increased from 131 million in 1940 to 150 million in 1950 and to 162 million in 1954, the resultant effect upon the workload of the Congress is obvious. Another very important factor affecting the workload of senatorial offices stems from the fact that today the

activities of Congress are brought home to the people directly and more fully through the combined mediums of the press, radio, and television, resulting in an increased awareness and consciousness on the part of the general public in the affairs of government and a more active expression of their views to their representatives in Congress with respect to legislative matters.

I should like to call attention to page 40 of the report. There is on the desk of each Senator a copy of the report of the Senate Office Building Commission. The only addition to the Senate Office Building since 1909 was made in 1933. When it is considered that the number of Senate employees totaled only 575 in 1909, and today they total 1,948, it is evident that the increase provided in office and committee accommodations falls far short of the proportionate increase in personnel.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. PURTELL. I am very happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Connecticut has given a very great deal of valuable statistical information, but I notice that he omitted—either by accident or design—stating the cost of the building.

Mr. PURTELL. Then I apologize. I thought the Senator from Illinois asked about the reason for the new building.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Connecticut state the cost of the building?

Mr. PURTELL. It will be within the 1948 appropriation of \$20,600,000. In order to do that, we have had to make some changes in the structure proposed in 1948—by eliminating the center wing, and we also have eliminated such parts as the physiotherapy portion of the building and the swimming pool. We shall be within the 1948 authorization. Does that answer the question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for the information. Does he think that at a time when apparently we do not have enough money to justify appropriations for an adequate number of hospitals, or enough money to put through a program adequate to protect the farmers, and when we have to reduce the size of the Army by three divisions, according to the administration, this is a time to spend in excess of \$20 million for an additional office building?

Mr. PURTELL. If the Senator from Illinois wishes me to reply, let me say that no time would be better than today. The last time this matter was before the Senate, it would have been possible to construct the building for substantially less than it will cost today. Today this building will cost us 23 percent more than it would have cost in 1948.

I am sure the Senator from Illinois agrees with me that there is no reason to expect that labor will be cheaper in the future, or that it should be cheaper. I cannot foresee a time in the future when this very necessary structure can be erected for less cost.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. PURTELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator from Connecticut heard our very able friend, the Senator from Illinois, argue that something should be done about the growing unemployment problem in the Nation today?

Mr. PURTELL. I have; and I am sure the Senator from Illinois would not object very much to the expenditure at this time of \$6 million, because I believe he referred to the sum of \$6,900,000 as chickenfeed. In that case, that would make this item just chick feed. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is there pending an amendment in regard to the item referred to by the Senator from Illinois?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois did not submit an amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in order to permit the Senate to vote on the item, I now move to strike out the committee amendment beginning on page 8, in line 14, and ending in line 2, on page 9.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, after that outburst, I almost forgot why I rose and addressed the Chair.

On page 28 of the bill, we find the following committee amendment:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 502. There shall be hereafter in the Department of Labor, in addition to the Assistant Secretaries now provided for by law, one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be subject in all respects to the provisions of the act of April 17, 1946 (60 Stat. 91), as amended (5 U. S. C. 611b), relating to Assistant Secretaries of Labor. Section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1950, as amended (64 Stat. 1263; 66 Stat. 121), is hereby repealed: *Provided*, That the present incumbent of the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary may be reassigned to an appropriate position in the Department without reduction in the rate of basic compensation.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order against that committee amendment because I consider it to be legislation on an appropriation bill.

Furthermore, I consider the provision to be a violation of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and also of section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 6, which calls for the establishment of an administrative Assistant Secretary who shall be on a permanent civil-service, merit-system basis, and who shall be in charge of accounts and records, as an Assistant Secretary who will not be in the policymaking area of the Department, but, rather, will be in what might be called the housekeeping branch of the Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I move to strike out the language on page 25 of the bill, from lines 9 to 13, inclusive.

This is language which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and I were discussing a short time ago. I have endeavored to get in touch with the Senator from Maryland, but I have not been able to do so. I regret that.

However, I now move that the language in lines 9 to 13, inclusive, on page 25 of the bill, be stricken out. If my motion is agreed to, this language will be in conference. I must explain why I believe it important to take it to conference. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has initiated a move of the headquarters personnel of the Old Age Insurance Division, and quite a number of the staff have acquired homes in the District of Columbia. They have canceled their rentals of property in Baltimore.

In the event that lines 9 to 13 remain in the bill, a great deal of hardship will be created in the case of the employees, because they will then be denied reimbursement for their expenses in making the transfer.

So if the Senate votes to strike this language from the bill, the item will go to conference, and then there will be an opportunity to produce not only information from the Department headed by Secretary Hobby, but also information from all others concerned, and it will be possible to ascertain how many employees have acquired new property in the District of Columbia or how many employees are involved in this matter, as a result of giving up their homes in Baltimore.

Therefore, I say in all frankness that I have tried to get in touch with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] to explain what has happened in this case; but he has left Washington, by train.

If my motion is agreed to, no irreparable damage will be done, because the item will be taken to conference. We shall merely be striking from the bill certain language voted by the House of Representatives; and, as a result, the controversy can be settled in a manner which will not result in doing hardship to the employees involved.

Therefore, Mr. President, I so move. I apologize that I am required to make the motion in the absence of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. However, if my motion is agreed to, no irreparable damage will be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, it is proposed to strike out lines 9 to 13, inclusive.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this amendment is in line with the recommendation of the committee, although it

is now approached in a different manner. For that reason I would have to support the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The only question in my mind—I wish to state this very clearly—is that the matter was previously passed on, at a time when both the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] were in the chamber. They are interested in this item, and now they have left for their homes, thinking the matter has been settled. I do not like to take advantage of any Senator at this hour of the night, after he has left the Chamber.

Therefore, I raise this point, inasmuch as the motion or amendment is submitted after the issue had supposedly been settled.

There is no question in my mind but that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has correctly outlined the parliamentary situation, and also that his motion or amendment is in line with the intention of the committee, when it passed on this item.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the Appropriations Committee there was no objection to what I now propose. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who now stands at my left, said that, to his knowledge, there was no objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not wish to become involved in a controversy between the distinguished Senators from Maryland and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota; but I will say there was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, to permit me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I wish to inquire about the parliamentary status of the language on page 25, in lines 9 to 13. I had understood that a point of order raised on the question of germaneness had resulted in eliminating the language which the committee had proposed to insert in lines 14 to 23, inclusive; but I did not understand that the point of order ran to striking out certain language on page 25.

Certainly a point of order could not be raised to striking certain language from the bill. A motion or amendment would always be in order to strike from the bill the portion of the committee amendment on page 25 striking out lines 9 to 13, inclusive. Such an amendment could not be ruled out on a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment acted on by the Senate proposed to strike out, on page 25, lines 9 to 13, inclusive, and to insert, on the same page, lines 14 to 23, inclusive.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. At the time when the point of order was made, would it have been in order to have divided the amendment as between striking and inserting?

Is not such an amendment always divisible?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under rule XVIII, an amendment to strike and insert is not divisible. It is now in order, however, to move to strike the House provision.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have tried to make it clear to the Members of this body that this is not an attempt in any sense to try to do something contrary to what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] was hoping for, but I do think we have created a problem which may be most embarrassing and difficult to Secretary Hobby of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In order that the provision may be in conference so that we may see how much harm and damage have been done to employees who have been asked to be prepared to transfer from Baltimore to Washington, and in order to have that question open, Mr. President, I move to strike the language found on page 25, lines 9 through 13. It can then go to conference and be taken care of in a manner that will not work a hardship on the employees.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Minnesota has stated the problem very properly, and I think that he has correctly stated the original intention of the committee.

The only thing I wish to make clear is that, in fairness to its Members, the Senate must act in good faith.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It seems to me that the Senator from Minnesota has stated a good case, except for the fact that the distinguished Senators from Maryland were not present at the time. I wonder if the chairman of the committee could not take the matter to conference with the understanding that if the Senators from Maryland object to the action taken here then he will repair the damage.

The Senator from Minnesota has pointed out that the damage certainly could be repaired in conference if this provision were not accepted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the objective which the Senator from Minnesota has in mind. I do not think the Senate can escape the fact that the Senator from Minnesota has in mind action which would produce a result opposite to the result that the Senate previously voted when it agreed with the two Senators from Maryland. We not only agreed with them, Mr. President, but after we voted in support of their position, a motion was then made to reconsider, and a motion to lay that motion on the table was agreed to. By that action I think we made doubly sure that the objectives of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the other Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] were carried out.

I raise a point of inquiry. Were there some things we did not move to lay on the table?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that was in connection with the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for information on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That question arose in connection with the civil defense item.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the amendment went out on a vote by the Senate that the provision was not germane, and, therefore, was not in order.

Mr. MORSE. It was not a yea-and-nay vote, was it?

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a case in which the suggestion made by the Senator from Alabama is the one we ought to follow, because I think we very definitely have some obligation to the two Senators from Maryland not to leave them in a position in which we give them some reason to believe that we have accepted their position, and subsequently reverse ourselves. It should go to conference with the understanding that the chairman will take it up with the two Senators from Maryland, and if they feel that the position which the Senate has sustained ought to be maintained, I think we ought to follow that course.

Mr. HAYDEN rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona desire recognition?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is just one fact which we must take into consideration, and that is that certain people who were residents of Baltimore have moved to Washington and have acquired property here, on the understanding that the office was to be moved to Washington.

The question will be whether under those circumstances the Senators from Maryland, would want to see those who have already left Baltimore compensated in some way.

I think with that understanding, if they insist that nothing be done, that is all there is to it. But if they are willing to take into consideration the needs of the people who have actually moved, then something might be done in conference. I think the chairman is able to give us that assurance.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I did not understand the chairman to take a position on this question prior to making his statement. If he desired to make a statement, I would like to know what his position is.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not know that I expressed it. I said that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] was correct in his parliamentary procedure; and he was correct, second, in the thought that the position he took was in accord with the wish and the will of the Appropriations Committee.

Then I raised the question that if the Senate is to continue to do business as a body, Senators must keep faith with what has been done, and faith with each other. The two Senators from Maryland left the Chamber feeling that they had accomplished their purpose. The Senator from New Hampshire desired

that the Senate itself realize this fact before it took action. I do not know that I expressed myself fully, except to explain the position.

Mr. HAYDEN. The chairman and I, as conferees, and the other conferees, will assure the Senate that if the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] insists that this language be stricken from the bill, we, as conferees, will see that that is done.

But, on the other hand, if they are willing to consider the plight of the people who have moved to Washington, and to let them obtain some relief, that may be attended to in conference. We can do it in that way. I am perfectly willing to give the Senate assurance that as a conferee, if the two Senators from Maryland say to me, "We insist that this language go out," I will vote to recede.

Mr. ANDERSON rose.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not see how there can be any question about the attitude of the Senators from Maryland. They are the ones who insist that this provision be put back into the legislation. Certainly when they left the Chamber there was nothing in controversy on this point. They had heard the explanation about people buying property, they had heard the explanation of people moving, and they still insisted. I do not see how we can do otherwise than to leave the language as it was then.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct. The only reason I raise the question is that I do not believe we were permitted sufficient discussion earlier in the evening to bring out all the facts.

Secretary Hobby, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has ordered this division. She has ordered the so-called headquarters personnel to be moved back to Washington from where they were moved at the outset of World War II.

Many innocent people are involved, who have acquired property, and I raise the question only for the purpose of trying to lay before the Senate the fact that we have created a hardship. If the provision is taken to conference, we have the assurance of the chairman and of the ranking Democratic member of the committee that if the Senate can see justification for some consideration of the employees, the amendment will stand as previously agreed to on the Senate floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in view of the unfortunate circumstances, wherein the Senators from Maryland necessarily had to leave the Chamber, they having left under the impression that certain action had been taken on the bill. While I have been doing everything possible to fulfill my commitment that we proceed to consider the farm bill tomorrow morning, and since this, I hope, is the last amendment to the appropriation bill, I shall suggest, if the Senate will agree, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The Senators from Maryland will be here tomorrow and will have an opportunity at least to discuss the matter. Perhaps it will be possible to find a basis of agreement with respect to it.

I hope the Senate will be able to complete consideration of the appropriation bill shortly after it meets at noon tomorrow, so that we may be able to proceed with the consideration of the farm bill early tomorrow afternoon.

PROTECTING THE NAME OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION FROM COMMERCIAL EXPLOITATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 3769.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3679) to amend section 709 of title 18, United States Code, so as to protect the name of the Federal Bureau of Investigation from commercial exploitation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is certainly a noncontroversial matter if there ever was one. Congress has passed similar legislation to protect the name and insignia of various veterans' organizations. We have done it for the Red Cross. We have even done it for Smokey the Bear. I am confident my colleagues will be willing to grant this protection to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The bill merely provides that no one may use the name "Federal Bureau of Investigation" or the initials "F. B. I." without the permission of the Bureau.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the eighth paragraph thereof a new paragraph, as follows:

"Whoever, except with the written permission of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, knowingly uses the words 'Federal Bureau of Investigation' or the initials 'F. B. I.', or any colorable imitation of such words or initials, in connection with any advertisement, circular, book, pamphlet, or other publication, play, motion picture, broadcast, telecast, or other production, in a manner reasonably calculated to convey the impression that such advertisement, circular, book, pamphlet, or other publication, play, motion picture, broadcast, telecast, or other production, is approved, endorsed, or authorized by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; or".

SMALL BUSINESS—THE PILLAR OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 16, 1954, I joined my colleague the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota and every member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business in introducing Senate Resolution 213 aimed at creating a permanent Senate Committee on Small Business. To

date, in spite of the fact that a total of 49 Senators, a majority of this body are sponsoring the resolution, it still rests quietly in the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and has not been advanced either by the committee or by the leadership of the Senate. This is not democracy in action.

There are more than 4 million small-business establishments in the United States. This is about 95 percent of all of our Nation's commercial, industrial, and service-type business concerns.

The Senate in 1950 established a Select Committee on Small Business because of an understanding that the welfare of the American small-business man was directly related to the preservation of our free-enterprise system. It has been my privilege to serve as a member of that committee ever since its creation. I know the important role it has to fulfill. I also know, Mr. President, that American small business is in danger and needs encouragement and protection from our Government. The signs in our economy all point to the tendency toward greater mergers and big business. This threat must be stopped if small business is to be protected. The creation of a permanent Senate Committee on Small Business would go far toward protecting the small-business man and a free enterprise economy.

I urge the leadership in the Senate to help bring Senate Resolution 213 for consideration by the Senate as a whole before the session adjourns. Small business has every right to be represented in the Senate by a committee equal in stature and responsibility to the other standing committees in the Senate.

The Senate Select Committee on Small Business has made many notable contributions through hearings, investigations, recommendations, and advice. But, it has been denied the opportunity to undertake the most vital of all jobs, the real work of the Congress, legislation. It seems almost ironic that America's small business establishments, beset as they are with so many difficult problems, should be represented in the Congress by any committee less than a standing committee. It is my fervent hope that small independent business will always be a vital part of the American scene. We must remove all doubt as to the permanency and ultimate necessity of a thriving small business community. Such a community deserves a permanent, legislative committee to speak for it.

Mr. President, my interest for the problems of small business is not sudden nor is it a matter of only recent concern. Indeed, my youth was spent working along with my father and brother in what we think is the best drug store to be found on main street of Huron, S. Dak. I still maintain my interest in that business and in the problems faced by that drug store and the many hundreds of thousands of small businesses like it in our economy.

When I first came to the Senate almost 6 years ago, I carried in my mind the vivid memories of the terrible days of the depression when I worked behind

the counter of our store and saw and felt the effect on our community when large price cutting organizations moved in on the independent businessman struggling to keep his head above water. I know the bitter miseries of predatory price competition. It is these experiences that have made me the consistent advocate and spokesman for one of the mainstays of our whole economy and way of life—the American independent small businessman.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

When I cosponsored and voted for the creation of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, I felt that this was a step in the right direction toward giving small business a needed voice in the Congress. I have been glad to serve on that committee since its inception. Naturally I was distressed when, early in the 83d Congress, a move was reported afoot to abolish the committee. In an effort to stop this I addressed a letter to the then majority leader, Robert A. Taft, in which I said:

I am writing to you to urge continuation of this vitally important committee. I voice my own deep convictions in this matter, as well as the concern of many Minnesota businessmen who have wired or written me, urging that the Select Committee on Small Business continue.

In its own and unfortunately too limited sphere, the Small Business Committee has done much toward helping the small-business man. The small-business clinics which were held by the committee in scores of cities including Minneapolis, did a fine job in taking Washington to Main Street, giving both legislators and businessmen a clearer understanding of the problems that were presented. In a similar vein I originated a series of small business-Government conferences which were held throughout the United States.

As a member of the Small Business Committee's Tax Subcommittee I came to recognize the fact that Congress should place a high priority on tax cuts which will strengthen independent business. I joined the committee in recommending:

First. An excess profits tax exemption for corporations earning under \$100,000 which would bring the \$25,000 figure to a more realistic level so far as small businesses are concerned. I voted for an amendment to the excess profits tax extension bill before the Senate in 1953 which provided an exemption for small corporations earning \$100,000 or less before paying excess profits taxes. Unfortunately, the amendment failed.

Second. More reasonable policies on depreciation allowances for small business.

Third. The exemption from surtax rates on corporations should be raised from \$25,000 to \$50,000 or \$100,000.

The higher limit would allow a successful growing business in the small- or medium-size bracket to become an effective competitor of his larger rivals.

Another activity of the committee with which I was intimately involved was our investigation on the growing shortage of newsprint. The matter first

came to my attention when, on a tour of Minnesota, I received many complaints from the editors of small-town weeklies that they were unable to get an adequate supply of newsprint. I suggested to the chairman the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that an investigation might be in order and soon after a newsprint subcommittee was appointed with myself as chairman. After extensive hearings, we made several recommendations as to how domestic production of newsprint might be increased so that thousands of small-business men publishers would not be wiped out by any future newsprint shortage.

AGENCIES FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Despite all this worthwhile activity by the committee, I felt that still more could be done to promote the welfare of small business by the establishment of administrative agencies devoted exclusively to this goal. As far back as 1949 I proposed an amendment which was adopted for the establishment of a special small-business office in the Department of Defense with a special assistant on small business to the Secretary. My amendment became law. I ask that an editorial appearing in the August 4, 1949, issue of the East Minneapolis Argus, concerning the proposal, be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY HAS A SOUND PLAN FOR HELPING SMALL FACTORIES

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY made a commendable move when he started action to set up a special small-business section in the military procurement office.

It is literally impossible at the present time for a small-business man, who cannot afford to have a personal representative constantly in Washington, to cut through the smiling, back-slapping, but ironbound resistance to small contractors that exists in the Pentagon and the Navy procurement offices.

As Senator HUMPHREY says, the currently much criticized "5-percenter" is a product of the present system. The small-plant operator is literally at the mercy of "brokers" if he wants a chance at Government contracts.

Locally it is important that manufacturers get a rightful share of contracts of the War and Navy Departments and manufacturing items allied with the European recovery program. At the present time they are not getting their share of either direct or negotiated contracts.

Time after time small local plant owners have told of trips to Washington in search of work to keep plants going and local people employed, but all in vain. They report a pleasant social swing around the Pentagon and Navy offices, where there are always pleasant smiles and ready handshakes—but that doesn't butter upper Midwest bread.

We are sure that Senator HUMPHREY's idea of creating a small-business section in the Military Procurement Office will meet with ready approval of most local manufacturers, and we feel that Senator THYE and Congressmen WIER, JUDD, and MCCARTHY will or should be ready to back HUMPHREY's plan.

In this community we have many top-grade small manufacturing plants. A large percentage of them are barely keeping their doors swinging both ways at the present time, while, at the same time, there are constant reports that hundreds of larger

establishments in the East and West have large backlogs of Army and Navy orders.

Senator HUMPHREY's idea, if worked out, and quickly, may provide the needed impetus to stop the current wave of increasing local unemployment. Let's hope so—and quick.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Later, in 1951, I cosponsored the creation of a Small Defense Plants Administration with similar functions. I voted for this measure in 1951, and again in 1952 to extend the life of the SDPA.

The successor agency to the Small Defense Plants Administration, the Small Business Administration, also received my warm support and my vote. However, I insisted that the Administrator not be controlled by either the Secretary of Commerce or Treasury but be independent so as to serve independent business. This was a stand that was heartily endorsed by the National Federation of Small Business, and I ask that their letter to me on this subject be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, July 3, 1953.

HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Of course we are concerned and disappointed, solely in the interest of small business of this Nation for whom we believe we have the authority to speak and act, that the conferees of the Banking and Currency Committees failed to report out the Small Business Administration Act with the proposed changes, all beneficial to small business, which we recommended to all Members of the Senate in our wire to them of June 19, in which we urged the conferees to correct that section of the act pertaining to the authority of the Advisory Board, consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Administrator of the new agency, and our recommendation was that such authority should be vested entirely within the confines of the new administration, subject at all times to the control of Congress.

We stated our objection to that section of the bill at public hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee May 27, and before the House Banking and Currency Committee May 15.

We were pleased to note that you gave serious consideration to our recommendation of June 19 and voted "no" to the establishment of the Small Business Administration as reported out by the conferees, which report included the provision to which we objected.

It is our hope and trust, in the sole interest of small business of this Nation, that you will urge the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to report out the amended Small Business Administration Act with the desired correction, and it is our further hope that that legislation, as amended, will be voted by the Congress prior to adjournment.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I received from my distinguished colleague who has been one of the foremost champions of small, independent business, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN],

former chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 3, 1953.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: I want to express my appreciation to you for your vote in behalf of small business when the conference report on the controls bill was before us several days ago.

As was well pointed out in the discussion on the Senate floor, the proposal that has come from the House of Representatives, if enacted into law, would scuttle efforts made to give small business a fair chance in the American economy.

The Small Defense Plants Administration, as you know, has been operating only a short time. It started from scratch. However, it has done a remarkable job in helping small business in this country due to the fact that it has been an independent agency responsive to the President and reporting to him without intervention of any department head or the necessity of going through any other office. The proposal that came from the House would have destroyed that independent status and would have crippled severely the effort of any man trying to administer the agency in behalf of small business.

This fact was well recognized in the statement that was sent to all Senators by one of the best small-business associations of the country. I refer specifically to the Small Business Association of New England.

You may recall also that George J. Burger, Washington representative and executive manager of the National Federation of Independent Business, one of the biggest small-business organizations in the United States, took a similar attitude.

Other small-business organizations from all over the country expressed themselves in the same manner because they all knew that destroying the independent status of the small-business agency would destroy the ability of that agency to do anything helpful to small business.

As chairman of the Small Business Committee for 3 years, I have found you always on the side of the small-business man. You have been a fine and faithful member of the Small Business Committee. Your upholding small business in this latest instance is simply a continuation on your part of the interest and effort you have always exerted for small business.

The fight is not yet won. I know that you can be counted upon to stay on the side of small business.

Sincerely,

JOHN
John Sparkman.

LEGISLATION FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, while small business needs agencies and committees to protect its interests, it must at the same time have men in Congress with votes to turn worthwhile recommendations into law and to successfully oppose unfavorable legislation. As I have stated earlier, one of the requirements of small business that has impressed me most strongly is the need for effective legislation to protect and expand small business. I, therefore, worked and voted for the strengthening of the Robinson-Patman Act, the Magna Carta of the American independent small-business man. I believe that the Robinson-Patman Act can justifiably be

called the "economic bill of rights" for free competitive enterprise.

When, in the 81st Congress, it was unsuccessfully proposed that we weaken the Robinson-Patman Act by making good faith a complete defense against charges of discrimination, I cooperated with all the major independent business organizations, voted against the measure, and succeeded in helping to defeat the proposal.

The Robinson-Patman Act must be guarded and defended. It is a shield of strength for free enterprise.

One of my most honored possessions is a letter that I received from one of the authors of that historic legislation, the distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Representative PATMAN's letter to me be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 8, 1953.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: I am very sorry about the unjustified and wholly unwarranted attack upon you because of your vote in favor of small business when you voted to recommit the bill providing for an extension of the Defense Production Act which did not provide sufficiently for a small business agency to take the place of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which is now being liquidated and is slated by the Republicans to go out of existence next June 30.

The fact is there is not a Member out of the 531 Members of the House and Senate who has worked harder, more consistently, and more effectively in behalf of the little man and small business than you have worked since you have been a Member of the United States Senate. During the time that you have been here we have been compelled to fight against passage of proposals that were intended to give big business every advantage and little business no opportunity to exist; particularly, I refer to special bills under high-sounding names to clarify the Robinson-Patman Act. Every one of these bills carried hidden provisions that only an alert, sincere, able Member like yourself would have detected that were intended to absolutely destroy equality of opportunity for the little man.

Only a few days ago, I heard one of the most important leaders in the United States Senate say, "HUBERT HUMPHREY is not only a sincere, conscientious person, but he is one of the ablest and best debaters in the United States Senate."

Independent business is fortunate to have a person such as yourself on the right side, and I sincerely trust that the unwarranted attack from greedy groups will receive no more attention than such attacks are entitled to receive. It is just another case of people who have a selfish ax to grind trying to cripple, harm, or retard a fine Member of Congress who is constantly working for the people and never fooled by the slick, deceitful propaganda of the clever lobbyist groups.

I want you to know, Hubert, that I am glad to be on your side and glad to be associated with you in the many fights that we have carried on shoulder to shoulder. If your record is bad, my record is bad, but the truth is you have a wonderful record in behalf of the little man, and I do not expect to have a better one.

Small business needs help now more than any time since I have been a Member of Congress during the past 25 years; the little man is in the greatest danger that he has ever been. Please do not let unfair attacks dampen your zeal because we need you now and will need you in the foreseeable future as never before.

With kindest personal regards and very best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

FAIR TRADE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, fair trade for American small business is one of the most important pieces of legislation to affect the business community that has come up in the Congress since I first became a Member of the Senate in 1949. It is one of the best insurance policies that the American people can take out for the protection of the American small-business man. I am proud of my successful efforts to enact a fair-trade law. We must maintain constant vigilance against the advocates of cut-rate competition and the forces of monopoly which seek to destroy independent small business enterprise.

Mr. President, I believe that my views on fair trade were best summarized in a speech I made before the National Association of Retail Druggists in 1949. I ask unanimous consent that certain portions of that speech be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM SPEECH BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS, SEPTEMBER 27, 1949

I support a policy of government that believes in fair trade for all parts of the American economy. To me, fair trade means a fair body of rules and regulations that preserves the competitive enterprise system but removes competition from the realm of unprincipled and vicious practices either by government or by business enterprise.

The principle of fair trade is much more broad in its meaning than just in the retail field. The basic purpose of American democratic government has been the guaranty of equality of opportunity and the preservation of individual liberty. In simpler terms, this is, in the language of the businessman, fair trade—a guaranty of the opportunity to do business with, to associate with other persons on a basis of fairness and equality, but at all times preserving the differences that come with individual initiative and the development of individual capacity. * * *

It is my observation that the sure path to statism, the sure road to collectivism, is the failure to recognize the basic needs of our people and the failure to protect and guard the free flow of commerce in an economic system that is based not only upon free enterprise, but upon individual enterprise.

I repeat—the heart and core of the American economic system is individual enterprise—the small independent businessman. The threat to the economic system is the ever-growing concentration of economic power, and that threat is a real one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, after the passage of the fair trade law there remained some doubt as to whether the President would approve the bill. Newspaper columnists at the time pointed out that, in view of my interest in the bill and my conviction that the welfare of our whole economy

demanding a fair trade law, I made a personal visit to the White House and urged the President to sign the bill. Naturally I was very pleased that the President finally did approve it. At the same time, I submitted a series of resolutions in the Senate which provided the basis for the creation of a special subcommittee on trade practices, the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, of which I was a member.

MONOPOLY

One of the greatest threats to competitive free enterprise and the American small-business man is the continued growth of monopoly in this country. I have, therefore, worked and voted for the strengthening of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and also of the Federal Trade Commission so that it might more effectively enforce the provisions of the Clayton Act. I was also one of the active participants in the fight against the basing-point bill which would have legalized discriminatory pricing so detrimental to small business, particularly in the Midwest.

FINANCING FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Fully aware of the difficulties often involved in small-business financing, I cosponsored a section of the Defense Production Act which made available extra loan funds for small-business defense plants and for taconite development in Minnesota and elsewhere. The junior Senator from Minnesota has consistently supported the small-business loan activities of the RFC and urged more liberal Government lending policies by the Small Business Administration. I fought against the administration's so-called hard money, high interest rate policy of the present administration, which has made it more difficult and costly for the independent businessman to obtain credit.

CASE WORK

I am glad to say that my office has given priority attention to the problems of small business and defense contracts for Minnesota firms. I think that I can say without exaggeration that we have helped hundreds of Minnesota enterprises in their relationship with the Federal Government. This has been particularly true when it has come to guiding them through the mystic maze of regulations that covers Federal procurement practices.

Most recently, in an effort to forestall abrupt Senate action on a bill designed to make extensive changes in the Atomic Energy Act and which might have serious effects on American small business and rural electrification cooperatives, I addressed a letter to the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business urging him to hold prompt hearings on the measure.

This is merely a part of my record in favor of small business. I have not discussed measures like the Humphrey-Durham Act to protect the professional standards of pharmacy and medicine and other measures which vitally affect a particular segment of small business. Nor have I cataloged the scores of parliamentary motions and votes, the hours of debate, that go into the passage of

successful small business legislation. However, I believe that the foregoing will serve at least as an indication of my position on small business. I am four-square for the preservation of a healthy, dynamic, small business community that will preserve the best elements of our American system of competitive free enterprise.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in connection with the farm bill, I have submitted an amendment, "7-20-54-A," dealing with the National Forest Administration. I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter written by Hugh B. Woodward, regional director of the National Wildlife Federation, and various other items dealing with the subject.

There being no objection, the letters, articles, and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., July 17, 1954.
JAMES B. CRAIG, Esq.,
Editor, American Forests Magazine,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRAIG: Your timely editorial in the July issue concerning the amended version of S. 2548 is most helpful.

The "foot in the door" objection which has been picked up, iterated and reiterated by many uninformed persons has absolutely no validity.

As a matter of fact, the grazing use of the national forest not only has its foot in the door under the Granger-Thye Act but the door is wide open.

The sections of this act giving special recognition to the grazing use, providing for national forest grazing advisory boards, requiring the Secretary to appoint such boards as the official representatives of the grazing use to which must be referred upon request any matter pertaining to "(1) the modification of the terms, or the denial of a renewal of, or a reduction in, the grazing permit, or (2) the establishment or modification of an individual or community allotment," and further requiring the Secretary, prior to the issuance of any regulation affecting the grazing use upon national forests to refer such proposed regulation to the local advisory board of each area that will be affected, and providing that if any recommendation of the advisory board is overruled, disregarded, or modified, the Secretary or his representative shall furnish in writing to such board his reasons for such action, certainly give preference to the grazing use over all other uses, which do not enjoy any such rights.¹

It would probably be far easier for the national livestock organizations to further strengthen their grip upon the national forests by amendment of the Granger-Thye Act than to amend S. 2548 as passed by the Senate.

I had received and very carefully analyzed the statement by the Forest Conservation Society of America which you published in the July issue long before I had fully made up my mind upon the bill.

I find nothing in their statement which, in my opinion, has any foundation as an argument in opposition to the bill.

Since the bill deletes from the appeal provisions any appeal from an order by the Secretary made for the protection of the forest range for the purpose of "preventing injury to such lands or to change the use

of such lands," this provision will automatically eliminate from the appeal section nearly all of the conflicts between grazing permittees and Forest Service administrators.

An examination of the record will disclose that these appeals in nearly every instance are from orders curtailing grazing use or changing grazing use.

In my opinion, the appeal provisions are wholly innocuous. I am extremely doubtful that such provisions will be invoked except in rare instances.

Even the right to place improvements upon the national forest by grazing permittees is limited by the provision of section 2 that such improvements can be made only under written agreement to be entered into between the Forest Service and the permittee.

Apparently, quite a number of organizations took a firm position against the bill when it was introduced and, despite the fact that the bill has been rewritten to meet their objections, they are unwilling or unable at this time to change their position.

In my opinion, unreasonable opposition to the enactment of fair and just legislation concerning the national forests by conservation organizations upon untenable grounds stultifies the influence of the conservation movement and its supporters.

I am hopeful that the Congress will not be influenced by imaginary defects in the proposed legislation.

It is very easy to conjure up "bugaboos" in the bushes which do not exist.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HUGH B. WOODWARD,
Director.

NOTE.—Section 12 of the Granger-Thye Act, which is section 580h of title 16, U. S. C. A., provides: "Of the moneys received from grazing fees by the Treasury from each national forest during each fiscal year there shall be available at the end thereof when appropriated by Congress an amount equivalent to 2 cents per animal-month for sheep and goats and 10 cents per animal-month for other kinds of livestock under permit on such national forest during the calendar year in which the fiscal year begins, which appropriated amount shall be available until expended on such national forest, under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for (1) artificial revegetation, including the collection or purchase of necessary seed; (2) construction and maintenance of drift or division fences and stock-watering places, bridges, corrals, driveways, or other necessary range improvements; (3) control of range-destroying rodents; or (4) eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds, in order to protect or improve the future productivity of the range."

H. B. W.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., August 2, 1954.
Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: The Aiken bill, S. 2548, which passed the Senate in amended form on March 8, 1954, is now incorporated as title VIII—National Forest Administration—in the amendment proposed to the farm bill, S. 3052, proposed by Senators AIKEN, HICKENLOOPER, SCHOEPPFEL, HOLLAND, and ANDERSON on July 29. We therefore thought it appropriate, as suggested by you, to restate our position with regard to this legislation.

The National Wildlife Federation, the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, and the Association of Midwestern Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners, after careful and full consideration have by separate and appropriate resolutions endorsed this measure as it was

passed by the Senate and sent to the House. Two minor amendments have been suggested, both of which are clarifying. Senator AIKEN has said that they would be acceptable to such proposal.

The National Wildlife Federation is a non-profit organization of sportsmen-conservationists constituted of affiliated federations in 47 of the 48 States, having a combined membership of more than 3 million individuals. It is interested in sound management programs relating to soil, water, forests, and wildlife.

The Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners is made up of the commissioners and directors of the fish and game departments of the 11 western public land States. These men live continuously and intimately with the problems of hunting and fishing, grazing of livestock, the cutting of timber, watershed management, and the recreational uses of the public lands. Their considered opinion on these matters should, therefore, be valuable to the Congress in evaluating the merit of a law relating to national forest lands, the major portions of which are located in these Western States.

These three groups are now on record in support of this important measure. The Association of Midwestern Fish, Game, and Conservation Commissioners is composed of the commissioners and directors of those States in the Mississippi watershed except those south of Missouri and Kentucky and have similar objectives as those in the western association.

We deem it fitting and proper to state the reasons which impel us to support this measure.

The amendments and revisions of the original bill (now title VIII of substitute S. 3052) have completely changed its import and effect. It is not longer a measure relating to one use only of the national forests: viz, grazing.

Now for the first time the bill as written contains full congressional recognition of the multiple use doctrine.

It directs administration in accordance with such pronouncement.

It implements such mandate by authorizing multiple use councils, including but not limited to representatives of grazing, mining, recreation, timber production, watershed conservation, wildlife, and the general public, to advise the Secretary of Agriculture on their own initiative or at his request "with respect to any question of policy affecting the multiple use of such lands."

The revised version has deleted therefrom those provisions of the original bill affording to grazing permittees privileges not afforded to others users of forest lands.

The bill now contains the essential provisions for which conservation forces have long contended.

As passed by the Senate (and as it now appears in title VIII of proposed substitute S. 3052) it is a fair and just bill giving congressional approval to all uses of the national forests and providing for protection of each use against any use becoming dominant to the detriment of other uses.

The National Wildlife Federation, as a policy, desires to maintain a fair and constructive attitude toward all legislation, recognizing economic necessities while defending natural resources in behalf of the general public, instead of a consistently negative attitude.

We hope that our policy is one of helpfulness to the Congress rather than of unreasonable opposition.

Respectfully submitted.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION.
By CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director.
By CARL D. SHOEMAKER,
Conservation Consultant.

¹ See secs. 580k, 580l, U. S. C. A., title 16, act of Apr. 24, 1950, c. 97, 64 Stat. 87.

IN SUPPORT OF THE AIKEN GRAZING BILL
(By Hugh B. Woodward, regional director,
National Wildlife Federation)

We attempt a sane and dispassionate evaluation of S. 2548 as passed by the United States Senate on March 8, 1954.

Such an approach must be divorced from unreasoning prejudice.

Prior legislation, sponsored and strongly supported by the national livestock organizations, has, in the minds of millions of American citizens, placed a "curse" upon any bill dubbed a "stockman's bill."

S. 2548, because of its background, suffers great distrust.

We must forget the ill-starred Barrett-D'Ewart bill.

We must disregard the circumstances preceding the introduction of the present bill and the language of the act as introduced. Whatever S. 2548 may have been at the time of its introduction, the amendments and revisions of such bill have completely changed its import and effect.

It is no longer, as termed in the title of the original version, a bill to stabilize the livestock industry, dependent upon the national forests.

As revised and passed by the Senate, it is now a broad declaration of congressional policy for the administration of all national forest lands.

A magazine article, recently published, severely critical of the original bill, strongly urged all conservationists to oppose its enactment.

Based on this article and other publications, widespread opposition persists because of lack of knowledge and understanding of the bill as passed by the Senate.

By the act of June 4, 1897, Congress declared the purposes of the forest reserves to be water and timber protection. (June 4, 1897; sec. 1, ch. 2, 30 Stat. 34; U. S. C. A., title 16, sec. 475.)

Other than these, Congress recognized no other values or uses of the forests until the Granger-Thye Act of April 24, 1950. (April 24, 1950; ch. 97, 64 Stat. 87, U. S. C. A., title 16, sec. 580k.)

This act dealt extensively with the grazing use of national forest lands. By it the grazing use became a congressionally recognized and approved use.

Conservation organizations and the general public have, for years, urged that Congress affirmatively approve and spell out the multiple-use doctrine.

Today, when the Senate has done exactly that, too many of our citizens fail to recognize the tremendous importance of such declaration.

Senator AIKEN's committee held extensive hearings upon S. 2548 in the Western States.

Weeks before the scheduled hearings, representatives of water users, wildlife associations, and conservation organizations were invited to attend such hearings and present their views.

After these hearings, the bill was completely rewritten. Throughout the text of the bill, the language pertaining to grazing as a single use was stricken out in favor of the language "occupancy and use."

BENEFITS OF THE BILL

Section 12 of the bill, as passed, provides:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall give full consideration to the safeguarding of all resources and uses made of these lands, including grazing, mining, recreation, timber production, watershed conservation, and wildlife."

An entirely new section (11) was added. This section provides for appointment of multiple use advisory councils at various levels.

These advisory boards may be constituted of representatives representing all uses of

the forests, "including, but not limited to, grazing, mining, recreation, timber production, watershed conservation, wildlife, and the general public."

Such councils may submit recommendations on their own initiative or in response to requests by the Secretary "with respect to any question of policy affecting the multiple use of such lands."

These sections establish a basic congressional policy for the administration of the National Forests for the benefit of the entire American citizenship. They implement the decision of the United States Supreme Court in which Justice Lamar, speaking for the Court, in 1911, stated:

"All the public lands of the Nation are held in trust for the people of the whole country." (*Light v. United States* (220 U. S. 537, 55 Law. Ed. p. 574).)

Section 10 of the amended bill clearly provides that the power of the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of the National Forests to fully protect United States forest lands is neither abated nor curtailed.

The bill authorizes a review of administrative decisions, except those made for the protection of forest ranges.

The amended bill establishes a right of ultimate appeal to a Federal court upon the record of the pleadings, evidence produced and proceedings before the Secretary.

Before the committee, Senator WELKER, of Idaho, strongly contended that such court review should be upon a trial de novo and should extend to appeals from cuts in grazing privileges made for the protection of the range or to bring about a change in the use of the range. (Report of the committee upon S. 2548, p. 4.)

This contention was rejected by the committee. Such rejection and passage of the bill with the broad exception of any review of a decision for the protection of the range greatly strengthens the position of the Secretary.

The power of the court to modify a decision of the Secretary is limited to a case in which the court finds that the decision of the Secretary "is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law."

Under the common law and the Constitution of the United States, such right presently exists. The legal staff of the United States Forest Service has so advised the Chief Forester. (1953 Report of the Chief of the U. S. Forest Service, p. 13.)

Arguments advanced against the original bill are not germane to the amended bill as passed by the Senate.

OBJECTIONS TO THE AMENDED BILL

Objections voiced to the amended bill, eliminating nonfactual objections, are as follows:

First. The bill is unnecessary; the present system of administrative control, without express congressional sanction, is preferable.

This argument, in our opinion, has no merit.

Congress has already fully recognized and protected the grazing use (Granger-Thye Act).

Administration by the Secretary of Agriculture fortified by congressional recognition and mandate for multiple use strengthens protection of public rights under administrative policy.

Without such legislation, an administrative policy may be changed by the Secretary of Agriculture. A reactionary Secretary could seriously impair the "service uses" of the national forests in favor of the "profit uses."

Such power under S. 2548 is limited by the congressional mandate established by section 12 of the amended act.

Second. The bill is an opening wedge which would permit amendment in favor of grazing permittees.

Such argument is fallacious and untenable.

There are less than 18,000 grazing permittees upon the national forests of the Western States. (Figures from data compiled by U. S. Forest Service in 11 western public-land States.)

Thirty-three million people are now using the national forests for recreation (1953 report of the Chief of the U. S. Forest Service, p. 1).

The fate of the Barrett-D'Ewart bill demonstrated the influence of 33 million people with the Congress of the United States as against the "profit interest" of a small number of grazing permittees.

Once passed, the bill can be maintained. Why shudder and shiver at the possibility of a remote contingency and lose the tremendous benefits which the public will obtain under the amended bill?

SUPPORT FROM CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS

Two strong conservation organizations have announced support for the amended version. They are:

1. The National Wildlife Federation, after a series of conferences of representatives of Western States and careful consideration by its conservation committee, at its last convention in March 1954, unanimously recommended endorsement.

2. In May 1954, the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, after hours of consideration and debate in the resolutions committee, conditioned upon two minor amendments, unanimously endorsed the bill.

We have received word that the amendments to recommend are acceptable to Senator AIKEN, chairman of the Senate Committee, and to Congressman HOPE, chairman of the House committee.

Both are clarifying amendments suggested by Elliott S. Barker, formerly a Forest Service employee and for nearly 25 years director of the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. He has, for many years, been a student of legislation affecting public lands.

His prestige, coupled with his careful analysis of the benefits under the bill, had great weight with the Western Association.

The proposed amendments stated in the Western Association's resolution are clarifying amendments, which had not been suggested prior to the passage of the bill by the Senate.

The resolution by the Western Association, unanimously approved, should carry very great weight with all conservationists and Forest Service supporters.

The fish and game directors of the Western States are the men on the firing line most intimately acquainted with the problems which develop by conflicts between the grazing use and the wildlife and recreational uses of the forests.

CONCLUSION

After a complete review of all congressional legislation affecting national forests; after many months of careful and conscientious study of S. 2548 from the time of its introduction through the committee hearings, careful analysis of the Aiken committee report to the Senate, and the debate and colloquy at the time the bill was passed by the Senate, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we have an abiding conviction that the merits of the amended bill justify and should command the support of every thoughtful citizen of the United States interested in the protection of the public values of our national forests.

Resolution 5

(Aiken bill, S. 2548, the use of national forests)

Whereas S. 2548 as amended and passed by the United States Senate on March 8, 1954, provides for establishment of multiple-use advisory councils to advise the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any questions of policy affecting the multiple use of national forests and lands administered by him under

title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; and

Whereas S. 2548 as amended and passed by the United States Senate on March 8, 1954, contains the following long-needed declaration of congressional policy, to wit: "Sec. 12. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall give full consideration to the safeguarding of all resources and uses made of these lands, including grazing, mining, recreation, timber, watershed conservation, and wildlife", which provision—

1. Is in the interest of the public generally and all users of such lands;

2. For the first time recognizes wildlife indigenous to such lands, and recreational resources which are becoming increasingly important to the public; and

3. Includes a clear-cut congressional recognition of the multiple-use principles for which this association has long contended; and

Whereas the title to said bill has been changed to read as follows, to wit: "A bill to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; and for other purposes," and undesirable features of the original bill have been deleted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, That the enactment into law of S. 2548 as amended and passed by the Senate on March 8, 1954, be hereby approved: *Provided*, That as a matter of equity and in order to conform said bill to the legislative intent of the Senate, two additional amendments are made, viz:

1. Amend section 2 to provide for compensation to all other use and occupancy privilege holders for loss of improvements placed upon such lands in the same manner and upon the same basis as provided for reimbursement to grazing privilege holders. The entire objective of this amendment may be simply accomplished as follows: In section 2, lines 7 and 9, after the words "grazing", place a comma and insert the words "use and occupancy", and in line 16, strike out the words "such range."

2. In section 4, line 6, delete the words "or range." This is necessary because it is obvious that range improvements on lands owned by the Federal Government should not, under any condition, be recognized as base property to qualify any person to obtain privileges on lands to which this bill applies; and be it further

Resolved, That for the reasons above stated, and conditioned upon inclusion of the two above listed amendments, which we recommend to the House Committee on Agriculture, the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners approve the passage of S. 2548 as amended and passed by the Senate on March 8, 1954; and be it further

Resolved, That our endorsement of this amended bill as passed by the Senate is without prejudice. We will vigorously oppose any amendments which would weaken the amended bill in favor of any profit use of such public lands to the detriment of the public uses thereof.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 345 OF REVENUE ACT OF 1951—AMENDMENT

Mr. FERGUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6440) to amend section 345 of the Revenue Act of 1951, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 4, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 3 (legislative day of July 2), 1954:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Paul Emmert Miller, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the remainder of the term of 14 years from February 1, 1954.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Earl L. Butz, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Elbert Parr Tuttle, of Georgia, to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Paul W. Cress, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the western district of Oklahoma.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Charles Swann Prescott to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we rejoice that Thy divine love and strength will never fail or forsake us as we face difficult tasks.

We humbly confess that we are daily holding counsel together to consider what is best for our beloved country but our efforts still seem so futile and fruitless.

Grant that we may place our faith and hope in Thee for Thou art the God of all wisdom and in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

Give us a clear vision of that which is important and vital and may we find the secret of living contentedly, happily, and victoriously.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 30, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3546) entitled "An act to provide an immediate program for the modernization and improvement of such merchant-type vessels in the reserve fleet as are necessary for national defense"; requests a con-

ference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MAGNUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CERTIFICATIONS TO UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to sundry resolutions of the House he did, on Friday, July 30, 1954, make certifications to the United States attorney, eastern district of Michigan, as follows:

H. Res. 693. The refusal of Paul Dorfman to answer questions before the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. Res. 694. The refusal of Allen Dorfman to answer questions before the Committee on Education and Labor.

KLYCE MOTORS, INC.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 484)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

AUGUST 3, 1954.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office on August 2, 1954, and said to contain veto message on the following:

H. R. 5185. An act for the relief of Klyce Motors, Inc.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the veto message.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5185, for the relief of Klyce Motors, Inc.

The bill proposes to pay Klyce Motors, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn., the sum of \$91,000 for alleged losses sustained in connection with the purchase, on May 25, 1946, of 109 surplus trucks from the War Assets Administration. The evidence discloses that these trucks were represented to be new, disassembled, and boxed for export. When the trucks were uncrated for assembly, it was discovered that certain parts were rusted and otherwise damaged in a manner necessitating repair or replacement. Government inspection personnel confirmed that the condition of these trucks did not conform to the warranty made to the purchaser by the disposal agency. A settlement agreement for breach of warranty was entered into in the amount of \$20,710, and the Government was released from further liability.

There must come a time in all negotiations leading to settlement between parties when final commitments can be made and thereafter relied upon by both parties. In this case, however, equitable considerations indicate that the Government should not insist upon strict adherence to its legal rights.

The records show that when the company, on April 17, 1947, accepted the settlement of its claim in the amount of \$20,710 (5 percent of the purchase price), they had already incurred a loss of over \$30,000 exclusive of assembly costs. On the other hand, the tabulation of loss elements which was inserted in the committee's hearings appears to include losses for which the Government is not responsible and for which it should not pay. The figures presented clearly do not justify the \$91,000 payment authorized by the bill.

Under the circumstances, I am compelled to withhold my approval from this bill. I believe, nevertheless, that a compromise adjustment is warranted. I suggest that the claim be reconsidered by the Congress. I would approve a measure which appears to be more realistic and which makes a more equitable adjustment and apportionment of the rights of both the Government and the company.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 2, 1954.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and, without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday next and on Monday of next week, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today and tomorrow, following the legislative business and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, and also to revise and extend his remarks and include certain extraneous matter.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY NASH, RETIRED DEAN OF THE CAPITOL GUIDES

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, administrations under the Capitol Dome have come and gone but Harry Nash, recently retired dean of the United States Capitol guides, remained for 40 years. Mr. Nash has been a part of the Capitol since 1914. He has witnessed the administrations of 7 Presidents and has served through 20 Congresses, from the 63d to the 83d.

Mr. Nash has been devoted to his job. He has carried with it a dignity and warmth. Hundreds of thousands of citizens of the United States and those from foreign lands, who have visited the Capitol, have carried away with them a lasting impression of the Congress. A for-

mer Senate Sergeant at Arms once said that the Capitol guides "have the feet to tramp the marble halls all day long, the gift of gab to hold squirming high-school kids, the knowledge to make it stick, and the dignity to match the scenery." Mr. Nash has more than fulfilled these requirements.

Harry Nash has explained the wonders of the Capitol rotunda, the whisper over the echoing stone in Statuary Hall—the old House Chamber where John Quincy Adams was stricken by a fatal stroke, and Abraham Lincoln sat as a Representative from Illinois—has pointed out the great and near-great in the two Chambers, tramped many miles a day, and answered hundreds of questions. Often tourists have returned to Washington and reminded Mr. Nash that his graphic words have "stuck" through the years and that they have remembered.

It has been said that Mr. Nash has regarded the "Order of the Guides" as several steps ahead of a Yale honor society. Under his watchful eyes new applicants for guide positions have been carefully screened. He has believed a critical mastery of classical art, knowledge and understanding of American history and the proper degree of dramatic interpretation, are essentials in bringing to life the traditions of our great Capitol.

Harry Nash, whose profile and manner of speaking are much like John Barrymore, was offered the curatorship of a theatrical museum several years ago. Most of the theatrical folk who come to Washington look him up. Harold Lloyd told him a few years ago, "You've got a longer hit record than I have. When I first went through the Capitol with you, I was climbing up the side of buildings. You're even better now." Mr. Nash tells of the time Senator Ashurst recited Hamlet's soliloquy for him and remembers it as "Beautiful—beautiful."

One of Mr. Nash's favorite tales is about the Solomon Islands potentate, Chief Kata Ragosa. While the chief's bare feet padded on the marble floors of the Halls of Congress, Harry Nash was trying to figure out what kind of pidgin English to use when the chief addressed him. But that problem was soon solved. In a faultless Oxford accent, the chief said, "I say, I should like to see Brumidi's frescoed canopy I have read so much about."

On another occasion Mr. Nash was a little perplexed as to how to approach the famous Brumidi mural of a stern George Washington demanding surrender from Cornwallis at Yorktown, as Winston Churchill was in his group. But Sir Winston spied it and with enthusiasm said, "Let's look at it. It's Yorktown, isn't it?" He then turned to Nash and remarked proudly, "You know I have some interest in the Capitol. My mother was an American."

It is not only the Oxford-educated chiefs or royalty or the world's great statesmen that Mr. Nash remembers. He remembers numerous experiences with hundreds of thousands of American schoolchildren and adult citizens. It is with genuine pride that we extend to Harry Nash our deepest thanks for the

vivid and lasting interpretation of these sacred halls he has left with the multitudes. He knows, as do we, that these multitudes have helped, and will continue to help, make this Capitol an everlasting monument to American democracy.

WHAT'S GOOD FOR GENERAL MOTORS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members two headlines which appeared in the New York Times a few days ago, the first is: "Westinghouse Volume Up 4 Percent, Net Jumps 27 percent to New Peaks."

The other headline is: "General Motors Net Earnings Soar to \$425,250,383 in Half."

The Times article further states that a year earlier the profit was \$312,854,787, which shows an increase in profits over the same period a year ago of \$112,395,596.

But most important of all the article goes on to explain that the increase in net profits was due in great measure to a reduction in Federal taxes of \$306,498,000. The question naturally arises, "Is what is good for General Motors, good for the country?"

FREE FOOD FOR JOBLESS IN PITTSBURGH

Within the past few weeks we have witnessed thousands upon thousands of unemployed being reduced to standing in line in order to apply for food for themselves and their families. In area after area in the greatest industrial State of the Union, Pennsylvania, in order to supplement the food basket and allay the hunger of literally many thousands, the Federal Government is doling out free food.

General Motors is doing good but do the increasingly large lines of relief supplicants indicate that, "What's good for General Motors is good for the country?"

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AUTHORIZING TAX REFUNDS ON CIGARETTES LOST IN FLOODS OF 1951

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4319) to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDING VETERANS' REGULATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7712) to amend the veterans regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDING VETERANS' REGULATIONS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OR USE OF BOTH BUTTOCKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7851) to amend the veterans' regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INCREASED PENSIONS FOR MEDAL OF HONOR HOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8900) to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INITIATING TRAINING UNDER PUBLIC LAW 550—KOREAN GI BILL OF RIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9395) to amend the laws granting education and training benefits to certain veterans to extend the period during which such benefits may be offered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is that not the bill that was approved under suspension, or a bill similar to it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It was approved.

Mr. FORD. I am informed by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that a substitute was approved last week, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that

this bill be stricken from the calendar and laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR MORE EFFECTIVE EXTENSION WORK AMONG INDIAN TRIBES AND MEMBERS THEREOF

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3385) to provide for more effective extension work among Indian tribes and members thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this bill will be called up under suspension of the rules today.

The SPEAKER. Well, it may be possible to pass it now.

Is there objection?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO INVESTIGATE REPORT TO CONGRESS ON CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION OF WATER RESOURCES OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2843) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of encouraging and promoting the development of Hawaii, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make continuing investigations relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii and to report thereon with appropriate recommendations, from time to time, to the President and the Congress.

Sec. 2. Prior to the transmission of any such report on a project to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies thereof for information and comment to the Governor of Hawaii, or to such representative as may be named by him, and to the heads of interested Federal departments and agencies. The written views and recommendations of the aforementioned officials may be submitted to the Secretary within 90 days from the day of receipt of said proposed report. The Secretary may thereafter transmit to the Congress, with such comments and recommendations as he deems appropriate, his report, together with copies of the views and recommendations received from the aforementioned officials. The letter of transmittal and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out all of line 3, down through and including all of line 9, and insert "That, for the purpose of encouraging and promoting the development of the Waimanalo, Oahu; Waimea, Island of Hawaii; and Molokai projects, Territory of Hawaii,

the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make an investigation relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of the irrigation and reclamation resources of the Waimanalo, Oahu; Waimea, Island of Hawaii; and Molokai projects, Territory of Hawaii, and to report thereon, with appropriate recommendations to the President and the Congress."

Page 2, line 25, strike out section 3.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the irrigation and reclamation resources of the Waimanalo, Oahu; Waimea, Island of Hawaii; and Molokai projects, Territory of Hawaii."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAFEGUARDING THE RIGHTS OF CERTAIN LANDOWNERS IN WISCONSIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8006) to safeguard the rights of certain landowners in Wisconsin whose title to property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey and grant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of some member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who will pay for this survey. Will it be the requirement of the Federal Government to pay for the survey or the people who are seeking the relief?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe the Federal Government will pay.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Where this problem really arises is where the Government does come in and make a survey which shows the lakes and the land to be different than the original survey that was made probably a hundred years ago. Thus there are questions as to the title of the land involved in the differences between the two Government surveys. This is to correct that situation in which some of these landowners find themselves. Going on the basis of the original Government survey, which was made at a time when most of this area was grown up with timber, it was difficult to make accurate surveys. They were made hastily. They were made primarily for the purpose of selling the timber, and the surveys were not completely accurate. Yet on the basis of those surveys the land was sold and patents issued. It might appear for instance, as it has in many cases, where an owner has property abutting a lake, according to an old survey.

It now appears under the new survey that he does not own that property at

all. According to the present description he owns property now a hundred yards from the lake.

Who owns the property in between? Basically the Government does.

This bill is to assure that those persons can have an opportunity to come in, pay a fair value, and get the property they originally thought they were purchasing. So it really arises out of two Government surveys, both being different, and we accept the latter survey as being the accurate one.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who claims ownership of real property abutting on a lake located within the State of Wisconsin, where the original grant of such property by the United States showed that title was conveyed to the actual shoreline, shall be held and considered for all purposes to own such property to such shoreline, notwithstanding any errors which may have been made in the original survey and grant; and no officer or agency of the United States shall have authority to take such property (or any part thereof) as public lands, or to make any survey or resurvey of such property for the purpose of declaring any part of such property to be public lands, unless actual fraud or gross error amounting to fraud in the original survey shall have been first established by a court of competent jurisdiction in an action brought by the United States for the express purpose of voiding the original survey, but all such claims or surveys or resurveys of any real property in Wisconsin shall be made by officers or agencies of the United States within 3 years from the date of the passage of this act and after the expiration of said 3-year period no actions for the recovery of any land in Wisconsin pursuant to the authority granted in this act shall be maintained by any officer or agency of the United States or the United States Government.

SEC. 2. (a) In any case where a person claimed ownership of real property abutting on a lake located within the State of Wisconsin, but where, prior to the date of the enactment of this act, such property (or any part thereof) was taken by the United States as public lands and sold pursuant to the act of February 27, 1925 (43 U. S. C., sec. 994), the Secretary of the Interior shall pay to such person (or, if he has since died, to his heirs) in a lump sum, upon satisfactory application made within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, an amount equal to (1) the price paid for such property by such person if he exercised his preference right to purchase under such act of February 27, 1925, or (2) the price paid for such property by the purchaser thereof if such person did not exercise such right.

(b) In the event that such property (or any part thereof) was taken by the United States as public lands prior to the date of the enactment of this act but has not been sold on such date, the Secretary of the Interior shall, within 3 months after such date, reconvey such property to the former owner thereof (or, if he has since died, to his heirs) without cost.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, whenever it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that a tract of public land, lying between the meander line of an inland lake or river in Wisconsin as originally surveyed and the meander line of that lake or river as

subsequently resurveyed, has been held in good faith and in peaceful, adverse possession by a person, or his predecessors in interest, who had been issued a patent, prior to January 21, 1953, for lands lying along the meander line as originally determined, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause a patent to be issued to such person for such land upon the payment of the same price per acre as that at which the land included in the original patent was purchased and upon the same terms and conditions. All persons seeking to purchase lands under this act shall make application to the Secretary within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act, or from the date of the official filing of the plat or resurvey, whichever is later, and the Secretary of the Interior shall cause no patents to be issued for land lying between the original meander line and the resurveyed meander line until the conclusion of such periods.

"SEC. 2. Upon the filing of a plat of resurvey under section 1 of this act, the Secretary shall give such notice as he finds appropriate by newspaper publication or otherwise of the opening of the lands to purchase under this act.

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall affect valid existing rights."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask a question of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I know what the purpose of the bill is, and the very fact that I did not reserve an objection shows that I am for the bill, but I want the record to clearly show what the gentleman mentioned briefly, that the people who bought the land originally thought they were buying to the water's edge.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a very strong point of equity in their favor, and I think the record should pointedly show that fact.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Not only did they think they were buying property up to the edge of the lake but according to the original Government survey, the original Government map, it shows that that is what they bought, because the land as described under and on the basis of the original survey of metes and bounds did show that property as abutting the lake.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is it exactly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. So they not only thought they were buying such property but the record shows the Government was selling lake shore property to these people.

Mr. McCORMACK. I simply wanted the point stressed in the record, because in reading the bill and report it impressed me very much as the most important point of justice in connection with the passage of this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if it is not true that the present owners or their predecessors have been in continuous, uninterrupted possession under color of title and claim of right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes, indeed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Wisconsin bordering upon inland lakes or rivers."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN USES OF PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1254) to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from California explain the purpose of this legislation to us?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the issuance by Federal agencies of permits, leases, or easements through State or local governmental bodies for a period of not to exceed 30 years within their respective jurisdictions. This legislation is urgently needed to permit cities and their local subdivisions to secure a tenure of use of sufficient duration to justify the expenditure of funds by State and local bodies for improvements of a permanent nature.

What we are really driving at here is situations in which a city like the city of Oakland wants to go into a national forest area and set up a youth camp, a place for young people to go for a mountain vacation, such as the summer camps sponsored by the Washington Star here in Washington.

Under present law they cannot get permits of long-enough duration to justify their making the amount of expenditure necessary in permanent improvements for those purposes.

This bill applies exclusively to public agencies—none for any private groups—only public agencies, allowing them up to a 30-year lease so they can build the kind of improvements necessary to carry out those types of activities of a public interest in the national forest and on public-domain lands.

We have the same problem around the lake which is to be created on the American River back of the Folsom Dam. The State park commission wants to go in there and develop public recreational facilities, but they have to have a little more time to justify the very substantial investment which is necessary.

Because this legislation requires a lease or a permit the Government agency involved can attach the conditions necessary to protect the public interest.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to thank the gentleman. We have the same conditions existing in the Allegheny National Forest in Pennsylvania.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the head of any department or agency of the Government of the United States having jurisdiction over public lands, national forests, and reservations of the United States is hereby authorized to grant permits, leases, or easements for a period of not to exceed 50 years from the date of any such permit, lease, or easement to States, counties, cities, towns, townships, municipal corporations, or other public agencies for the purpose of constructing and maintaining on such lands public buildings or other public works. In the event such lands cease to be used for the purpose for which such permit, lease, or easement was granted, the same shall thereupon terminate.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike the words "United States" and insert in lieu thereof the words "United States, excepting national parks and monuments."

Page 1, line 7, strike the word "fifty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty."

Page 2, following line 3, add a new section 2, as follows:

"Sec. 2. The authority conferred by this act shall be in addition to, and not in derogation of any authority heretofore conferred upon the head of any department or agency of the Government of the United States to grant permits, leases, easements, or rights-of-way."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VALIDATING CERTAIN LEAVE PAYMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 22) to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a), notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended (37 U. S. C. 33 (c)), any payments for accrued leave heretofore erroneously made to any member of the Armed Forces who was discharged after August 31, 1946, for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period are hereby validated.

(b) In any case in which any member or former member of the Armed Forces of the United States has received any erroneous payment which is validated by subsection (a) of this section and has been required to repay to the United States all or a portion of such erroneous payment, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to such member or former member, or in the event he is deceased, to the person entitled to receive his arrears of pay in accordance with the act of June 30, 1906, as amended (10 U. S. C. 868), a sum equal to any amount so repaid which has not been refunded to him.

(c) The Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for any payment validated by this act.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: Page 1, strike out all of line 10 and on page 2 strike out lines 1 through 11, and on page 2, line 12, change the "(c)" to "(b)."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. Would the gentleman please explain what change this makes in the bill as reported by the committee?

Mr. HARDY. I will be glad to do that. The bill as reported from the committee was based on some misinformation presented to the committee. The bill refers to a total of 51 members of the armed services that were erroneously paid. Without my amendment there would be a duplication of payment to 11 men. With the amendment everybody will come out even.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING EMERGENCY CREDIT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3245) to provide emergency credit.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONTROL OF INCIPIENT OR EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECT PESTS OR PLANT DISEASES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3697) to amend the act of April 6, 1937, as amended, to include cooperation with the Government of Canada or Mexico or local Canadian or Mexican authorities for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of April 6, 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 148), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with the Government of Canada or Mexico or local Canadian or Mexican authorities in carrying out in such countries necessary operations or measures to control incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases, when such operations or measures are necessary to protect the agriculture of the United States. In performing the operations or measures authorized under this act, the cooperating foreign country, State, or local agency shall be responsible for the authority necessary to carry out the operations or measures on all lands and properties within the foreign country or State other than those owned or controlled by the Federal Government and for such other facilities and means as in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture are necessary."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS IN COCOLI, C. Z.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7334) to authorize certain property transactions in Cocoli, C. Z., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company, respectively, are authorized to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without exchange of funds, all or so much of the facilities, buildings, structures, and improvements of the respective transferor agencies situated at or within the town of Cocoli, C. Z., as may be mutually acceptable for transfer. Such facilities, buildings, structures, and improvements may be used, among other things, for occupancy by civilian personnel in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 5, 1928 (ch. 126, 45 Stat. 193), and by personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service and their dependents on a rental basis without forfeiture of any rental allowances, including occupancy in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 2, 1945 (ch. 227, 59 Stat. 316): *Provided*, That upon any transfer by the Canal Zone Government under this act, the capital investment in the transferred facilities, buildings, structures, and improvements shall be eliminated from the investment of the United States in the Canal Zone Government, but shall not be included in the costs of operation of that agency: *And provided further*, That transfers made by the Panama Canal Company under this act shall be subject to the provisions of section 246 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as added by the act of June 29, 1948 (ch. 706, sec. 2, 62 Stat. 1076).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF 40 ACRES OF LAND IN NORTHERN CHEYENNE INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8897) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer 40 acres of land in the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Mont., to School District No. 6, Rosebud County, Mont.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to transfer by patent to School District No. 6, Rosebud County, Mont., all right, title, and interest of the United States and the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, reserving however to the said Northern Cheyenne Tribe all mineral rights, including gas and oil, as provided by the act of June 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 690), in and to a tract of 40 acres of land within the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, described as the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter, section 33, township 2 south, range 41 east, Montana principal meridian, subject to such existing easement, right-of-way or other interest as may now be held by the State of Montana for the routing of State Highway No. 8.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all of line 3 and insert "That notwithstanding any contrary provision of law the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, is hereby authorized and directed."

Page 1, line 7, after "Montana", insert "or to any other appropriate governmental agency or local school authority in Montana empowered to take title to land for construction of a public school, in accordance with the resolution of January 29, 1954, by the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "3, 1926 (44 Stat. 690), in and to a tract of 40 acres of" and insert "3, 1926 (ch. 450, 44 Stat. 690), in and to a tract of approximately 40 acres of."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "principal" and insert "prime."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATING PARKING AT POST OFFICE BUILDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9825) to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to prohibit or regulate the use, for the parking or storage of vehicles of any kind, of any property under his custody and control which is owned by the United States for postal purposes and over which the United States has exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. Whoever violates any regulation prescribed by the Postmaster General under authority of this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$25; but no individual shall be liable for violating any such regulation unless at the time of such violation there was posted in a conspicuous place on the property with respect to which such violation occurred a notice calling attention to this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTMENT OR CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN CHARGES ON THE MILK RIVER PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7813) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to adjust or cancel certain charges on the Milk River project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Montana to explain what this bill is about?

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Speaker, a year ago we passed a law providing for certain adjustments in repayment charges on the Milk River irrigation project in Montana. We thought we had taken care of all of the provisions necessary, but under an interpretation by the attorneys downtown, we found that the law as passed did not apply to some 2,000 acres that it should have applied to. This bill simply carries out the intent of the law passed a year ago in connection with these 2,000 acres.

Mr. GAVIN. What is the amount of money involved?

Mr. D'EWARD. The amount of money involved is \$37,429.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. D'EWARD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion and notwithstanding the provision of any other law, adjust or cancel any charges which have accrued, or which will hereafter accrue, under Public Notice No. 5, Milk River project, Montana.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "charges" and insert "charges, including penalties."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6310) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to exempt operations in the transportation of livestock, fish, and agricultural, floricultural, and horticultural commodities from the act and from regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the sponsor of the bill or some member of the committee explain the departmental position on this legislation?

Mr. YOUNGER. I will be very glad to do that. The Secretary of Commerce filed a report with the committee stating that the Civil Aeronautics Board was holding a general hearing on freight-forwarder regulations, and he thought consideration of the bill ought to be delayed for that reason. But the committee, after the hearing, felt it was necessary, in order for the shippers to get relief now, that this bill should pass. The Secretary of Agriculture thought that we ought to regulate the vehicle as we do under the Motor Vehicle Act, but that cannot be done now.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand, there was no fundamental opposition from the Department.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 416 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Neither this title, nor any rule, regulation, term, condition, or limitation pre-

scribed under this title, shall apply to any person who engages indirectly in air transportation of property consisting of livestock, fish (including shellfish), or agricultural, floricultural, or horticultural commodities (not including manufactured products thereof), and who, in the ordinary and usual course of his undertaking, (1) assembles and consolidates or provides for assembling and consolidating shipments of such property, and performs or provides for the performance of break-bulk and distributing operations with respect to such consolidated shipments, and (2) assumes responsibility for the transportation of such property from point of receipt to point of destination, and (3) utilizes for the whole or any part of the transportation of such shipments, the services of a direct air carrier, if such person does not otherwise engage in air transportation."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATING THE SONS OF UNION VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8034) for the incorporation of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following named persons to wit: General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, New York; Maj. Gen. Amos A. Fries, and Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, 3d, retired, Washington, D. C.; Department of California, Charles Boynton, Frank Worner, and Wilbur Coursey; Department of Colorado and Wyoming, Roy A. Davis; Department of Iowa, Roy J. Bennett, Homer L. Young, and Dr. L. L. Shoppe; Department of Indiana, Angus Ogburn, Thomas M. Horn, and Alonzo R. Stanfield; Department of Kansas, E. S. Spangler, A. P. Phillips, and William Dix; Department of Massachusetts, Brig. Gen. Otis M. Whitney, Charles H. E. Moran, Col. Frederic Gilbert Bauer, and Gov. Alvan Tufts Fuller; Department of Michigan, Charles R. Cowdin, Birt Hammong, Charles F. Dexter, and Donald F. Peacock; Department of Minnesota, Donald C. Bennyhoff and William A. Anderson; Department of New Hampshire, Wallace L. Mason, Cleon E. Heald, and Col. Edward Black, retired; Department of New Jersey, Albert C. Lambert, Charles A. Otto, C. Wesley Armstrong, and Dr. Karl Rothschild; Departments of Oregon and Washington, Frederick K. Davis, Dr. W. E. Buchanan, Edgar L. Gale, Austin D. McReynolds, and Glenn L. Adams; Department of Pennsylvania, C. Leroy Stout and Walter C. Mabie; Department of Wisconsin, Edward T. Fairchild, Roland J. Steinle, Lyall T. Beggs, and Dr. William Martin Lamers; Department of Ohio, William M. Coffin, Homer A. Ramey, Miles S. Kuhn, and S. Anselm Skelton; and their associates and successors, are hereby created a body corporate by the name of "The Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War", by which name it shall be a person in law, capable of suing and being sued and of having and exercising all incidental powers, as a litigant or otherwise, as if it were a natural person, with power to acquire by purchase, gift, devise or bequest, absolutely or in trust for the purposes for which it is incorporated, and to hold, convey or otherwise dispose of such property, real or personal, as may be necessary or calculated to carry into effect the patriotic, fraternal, educational, and charitable purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 2. Eligibility for full membership in the corporation, and the rights and privileges of members shall be determined according to the constitution and bylaws of the cor-

poration, but shall be limited to male blood relatives of persons who served as soldiers or sailors of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps or Revenue Cutter Service between April 12, 1861, and April 9, 1865, and of such State regiments as were called into active service and subject to the orders of the United States general officers between the dates above mentioned and were honorably discharged therefrom at the close of such service or who died in such service.

SEC. 3. The object and purpose of this organization shall be: To perpetuate the memory of the Grand Army of the Republic and of the men who saved the Union in 1861 to 1865; to assist in every practicable way in the preservation and making available for research of documents and records pertaining to the Grand Army of the Republic and its members; to cooperate in doing honor to all those who have patriotically served our country in any war; to teach patriotism and the duties of citizenship; the true history of our country, and the love and honor of our flag; to oppose every tendency or movement that would weaken loyalty or make for the destruction of impairment of our constitutional Union; and to inculcate and broadly sustain the American principles of representative government, of equal rights, and of impartial justice for all.

SEC. 4. The supreme governing and controlling authority in said organization shall be the national encampment thereof, composed of such officers and representatives from the several State and other local subdivisions as may now or hereafter be authorized by the said encampment: *Provided*, That the present form of government of said organization shall never be so changed as not to be representative of the membership at large or to permit the concentration of the control thereof in the hands of a limited number or in a self-perpetuating body not so representative.

The meetings of the national encampment may be held in any State or Territory or in the District of Columbia, but it shall always maintain in the District of Columbia an official upon whom process and other legal notices may be served, and it may hold property in any State or Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia consistent with the local laws pertaining thereto.

SEC. 5. The corporate existence of said organization shall continue until it shall be dissolved in any manner provided by law, and it shall each year submit to the Congress a report of the proceedings of its national encampment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That the following-named persons to wit: General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, New York; Maj. Gen. Amos A. Fries, retired, and Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, 3d, retired, Washington, D. C.; Charles Boynton, Long Beach, Calif.; Frank Worner, Inglewood, Calif.; Wilbur Coursey, Fresno, Calif.; Roy A. Davis, Colorado Springs, Colo.; Angus Ogborn, Richmond, Ind.; Thomas M. Horn, Lafayette, Ind.; Alonzo R. Stanfield, Indianapolis, Ind.; Roy J. Bennett, Des Moines, Iowa; Homer L. Young, Waterloo, Iowa; Dr. L. L. Shoppe, Des Moines, Iowa; E. S. Spangler, Newton, Kans.; A. P. Phillips, Newton, Kans.; William Dix, Newton, Kans.; F. Harold Dubord, Waterville, Maine; Hon. Bureleigh Martin, Augusta, Maine; Gen. William E. Southard, Bangor, Maine; George W. Kimball, Chelsea, Mass.; Brig. Gen. Otis M. Whitney, Concord, Mass.; Charles H. E. Moran, Holyoke, Mass.; Gov. Alvan Tufts Fuller, Boston, Mass.; Charles R. Cowdin, Detroit, Mich.; Birt Hammong, Jackson, Mich.; Charles F. Dexter, Detroit, Mich.; Donald F. Peacock, Detroit, Mich.; Dewey B. Mead, Minneapolis, Minn.; Donald C. Bennyhoff, Hennepin County, Minn.; William A.

Anderson, Minneapolis, Minn.; Laurence J. Parker, Bennington, N. H.; Wallace L. Mason, Keene, N. H.; Cleon E. Heald, Keene, N. H.; Col. Edward Black, retired, Bennington, N. H.; Albert C. Lambert, Trenton, N. J.; Col. Frederic G. Bauer, Ridgewood, N. J.; Charles A. Otto, Elizabeth, N. J.; C. Wesley Armstrong, Trenton, N. J.; Dr. Karl Rothschild, New Brunswick, N. J.; Rev. Hermon L. Brockway, Ithaca, N. Y.; William M. Coffin, Cincinnati, Ohio; Homer A. Ramey, Toledo, Ohio; Miles S. Kuhn, Dayton, Ohio; S. Anselm Skelton, Portsmouth, Ohio; Frederick K. Davis, Eugene, Oreg.; Dr. W. E. Buchanan, Eugene, Oreg.; Austin D. McReynolds, Eugene, Oreg.; Glenn L. Adams, Salem, Oreg.; John H. Runkle, Harrisburg, Pa.; C. Leroy Stoudt, Reading, Pa.; Walter C. Mable, Philadelphia, Pa.; Edgar L. Gale, Seattle, Wash.; Edward T. Fairchild, Madison, Wis.; Roland J. Steinle, Milwaukee, Wis.; Lyall T. Beggs, Madison, Wis.; and Dr. William Martin Lamers, Wauwatosa, Wis.; and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia, where its legal domicile shall be, by the name of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War (hereinafter referred to as the corporation), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

"SEC. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this act, acting in person or by written proxy, are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws not inconsistent with this act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

"SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be: To perpetuate the memory of the Grand Army of the Republic and of the men who saved the Union in 1861 to 1865; to assist in every practicable way in the preservation and making available for research of documents and records pertaining to the Grand Army of the Republic and its members; to cooperate in doing honor to all those who have patriotically served our country in any war; to teach patriotism and the duties of citizenship, the true history of our country, and the love and honor of our flag; to oppose every tendency or movement that would weaken loyalty to, or make for the destruction or impairment of, our constitutional Union; and to inculcate and broadly sustain the American principles of representative government, of equal rights, and of impartial justice for all.

"SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

"(1) to have succession by its corporate name;

"(2) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

"(3) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

"(4) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the activities of the corporation may require;

"(5) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws; not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

"(6) to contract and be contracted with;

"(7) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the

ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

"(8) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber and otherwise alienate real, personal or mixed property; and

"(9) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal and State laws; and

"(10) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

"SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights, privileges, and designation of classes of members shall, except as provided in this act, be determined as the constitution and bylaws of the corporation may provide. Eligibility for membership in the corporation shall be limited to male blood relatives of persons who served between April 12, 1861, and April 9, 1865, as soldiers or sailors of the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps or Revenue-Cutter Service, and of such State regiments as were called into active service and were subject to orders of United States general officers between the dates above mentioned and were honorably discharged therefrom at the close of such service or who died in such service.

"SEC. 6. The supreme governing authority of the corporation shall be the national encampment thereof, composed of such officers and elected representatives from the several State and other local subdivisions of the corporate organization as shall be provided by the constitution and bylaws: *Provided*, That the form of the government of the corporation shall always be representative of the membership at large and shall not permit the concentration of the control thereof in the hands of a limited number of members or in a self-perpetuating group not so representative. The meetings of the national encampment may be held in any State or Territory or in the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 7. (a) During the intervals between the national encampments, the council of administration shall be the governing board of the corporation and shall be responsible for the general policies, program, and activities of the corporation.

"(b) Upon the enactment of this act the membership of the initial council of administration of the corporation shall consist of the present members of the council of administration of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, the corporation described in section 18 of this act, or such of them as may then be living and are qualified members of said council of administration, to wit: Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, 3d, retired; Dewey B. Mead; Rev. Hermon L. Brockway; Laurence J. Parker; George W. Kimball; Frederick K. Davis; and Albert C. Lambert.

"(c) Thereafter, the council of administration of the corporation shall consist of not less than 7 members elected in the manner and for the term prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

"SEC. 8. The officers of the corporation shall be a commander in chief, a senior vice commander in chief, a junior vice commander in chief, a secretary and a treasurer (which latter two offices may be held by one person), and such other officers as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws. The officers of the corporation shall be selected in such manner and for such terms and with such duties and titles as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

"SEC. 9. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Trenton, N. J., or in such other place as may be determined by the council of administration; but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the various States, the District of Columbia, and Territories and possessions of the United States.

"(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

"Sec. 10. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the council of administration of the corporation.

"(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers or employees. Any member of the council of administration who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

"Sec. 11. The corporation and its officers and agents as such shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for public office.

"Sec. 12. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

"Sec. 13. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

"Sec. 14. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its national encampments and council of administration. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

"Sec. 15. (a) The financial transactions of the corporation shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

"(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than March 1 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

"Sec. 16. On or before March 1 of each year the corporation shall report to the Congress on its activities during the preceding fiscal year. Such report may consist of a report on the proceedings of the national encampment covering such fiscal year. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

"Sec. 17. The corporation and its subordinate divisions shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name, the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War. The corporation shall have the exclusive and sole right to use, or to allow or refuse the use of, such emblems, seals, and badges as it may legally adopt, and such emblems, seals, and badges as have heretofore been used by the Illinois

corporation described in section 18 and the right to which may be lawfully transferred to the corporation.

"Sec. 18. The corporation may acquire the assets of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all of the liability of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the State of Illinois applicable thereto.

"Sec. 19. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation shall be distributed in accordance with the determination of the council of administration and in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto.

"Sec. 20. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAFETY ON THE GREAT LAKES BY MEANS OF RADIO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3464) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to make certain provisions for the carrying out of the agreement for the promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by inserting after paragraph (dd) the following:

"(ee) 'Great Lakes Agreement' means the agreement for the promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio in force and the regulations referred to therein."

Sec. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 4 (f) (3) of such act is amended to read as follows: "The Commission shall fix a reasonable rate of extra compensation for overtime services of engineers in charge and radio engineers of the Field Engineering and Monitoring Bureau of the Federal Communications Commission, who may be required to remain on duty between the hours of 5 o'clock postmeridian and 8 o'clock antemeridian or on Sundays or holidays to perform services in connection with the inspection of ship radio equipment and apparatus for the purposes of part II of title III of this act or the Great Lakes agreement, on the basis of one-half day's additional pay for each 2 hours or fraction thereof of at least 1 hour that the overtime exceeds beyond 5 o'clock postmeridian (but not to exceed 2½ days' pay for the full period from 5 o'clock postmeridian to 8 o'clock antemeridian) and 2 additional days' pay for Sunday or holiday duty."

(b) The last proviso of such section 4 (f) (3) is amended by striking out "inspectors" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "engineers."

Sec. 3. Title V of such act is amended by inserting after section 506 a new section reading as follows:

"VIOLATION OF GREAT LAKES AGREEMENT"

"Sec. 507. (a) Any vessel of the United States that is navigated in violation of the provisions of the Great Lakes agreement or the rules and regulations of the Commission made in pursuance thereof and any vessel of a foreign country that is so navigated on waters under the jurisdiction of the United

States shall forfeit to the United States the sum of \$500 recoverable by way of suit or libel. Each day during which such navigation occurs shall constitute a separate offense.

"(b) Every willful failure on the part of the master of a vessel of the United States to enforce or to comply with the provisions of the Great Lakes agreement or the rules and regulations of the Commission made in pursuance thereof shall cause him to forfeit to the United States the sum of \$100."

Sec. 4. Section 504 (b) of such act is amended by deleting "title III, part II" and inserting in lieu thereof "part II of title III and section 507."

Sec. 5. Section 602 (e) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The act entitled 'An act to require apparatus and operators for radio communication on certain ocean steamers,' approved June 24, 1910, as amended, is hereby repealed."

Sec. 6. This act shall take effect on November 13, 1954.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2453) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to implementing the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea relating to radio equipment and radio operators on board ship.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 351 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(1) For any ship of the United States, other than a cargo ship of less than 500 gross tons, to be navigated in the open sea outside of a harbor or port, or for any ship of the United States or any foreign country, other than a cargo ship of less than 500 gross tons, to leave or attempt to leave any harbor or port of the United States for a voyage in the open sea, unless such ship is equipped with an efficient radio installation in operating condition in charge of and operated by a qualified operator or operators, adequately installed and protected so as to insure proper operation, and so as not to endanger the ship and radio installation, as hereinafter provided, and in the case of a ship of the United States, unless there is on board a valid station license issued in accordance with this act: *Provided*, That the Commission may defer the application of the provisions of this section for a period not beyond January 1, 1955, with respect to cargo ships of less than 1,600 gross tons not subject to the radio requirements of the Safety Convention when it is found impracticable to obtain or install equipment necessary for compliance therewith.

"(2) For any ship of the United States of 1,600 gross tons, or over, to be navigated outside of a harbor or port, in the open sea, or for any such ship of the United States or any foreign country to leave or attempt to leave any harbor or port of the United States for a voyage in the open sea, unless such ship is equipped with an efficient radio direction finding apparatus (radio compass) properly adjusted in operating condition as hereinafter provided, which apparatus is approved by the Commission: *Provided*, That the Commission may defer the application of the provisions of this section with respect to radio direction finding apparatus to a ship or ships between 1,600 and 5,000 gross

tons for a period not beyond November 19, 1954, if it is found impracticable to obtain or install such direction finding apparatus."

(b) Paragraph (3) of section 352 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) A foreign ship belonging to a country which is a party to any Safety Convention in force between the United States and that country which ship carries a valid certificate exempting said ship from the radio provisions of that Convention, or which ship conforms to the radio requirements of such convention or regulations and has on board a valid certificate to that effect, or which ship is not subject to the radio provisions of any such convention;"

(c) Section 352 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) If, because of unforeseeable failure of equipment, a ship is unable to comply with the equipment requirements of this part without undue delay of the ship, the mileage limitations set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) shall not apply: *Provided*, That exemption of the ship is found to be reasonable or necessary in accordance with subsection (b) to permit the ship to proceed to a port where the equipment deficiency may be remedied."

(d) Section 353 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"OPERATORS, WATCHES, AUTO-ALARM—RADIO-TELEGRAPH EQUIPPED SHIPS"

"SEC. 353. (a) Each cargo ship required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation and which is not fitted with an auto-alarm, and each passenger ship required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation, shall, for safety purposes, carry at least two qualified operators."

"(b) A cargo ship, required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation, which is fitted with an auto-alarm in accordance with this title, shall, for safety purposes, carry at least one qualified operator who shall have had at least 6 months' previous service in the aggregate as a qualified operator in a station on board a ship or ships of the United States."

"(c) Each ship of the United States required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation shall, while being navigated outside a harbor or port, keep a continuous watch by means of qualified operators: *Provided*, That in lieu thereof, on a cargo ship fitted with an auto-alarm in proper operating condition, a watch of at least 8 hours per day, in the aggregate, shall be maintained by means of a qualified operator."

"(d) The Commission shall, when it finds it necessary for safety purposes, have authority to prescribe the particular hours of watch on a ship of the United States which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation."

"(e) On all ships of the United States fitted with an auto-alarm, said apparatus shall be in operation at all times while the ship is being navigated outside of a harbor or port when the operator is not on watch."

SEC. 2. Such act is amended by—

(1) redesignating sections 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, and 362 thereof as sections 355, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, and 364 thereof, respectively; and

(2) amending each such section number wherever it appears therein to conform to the redesignation prescribed by paragraph (1) of this subsection."

(b) Such act is amended by inserting immediately after section 353 thereof, the following new section:

"OPERATORS, WATCHES—RADIO-TELEPHONE EQUIPPED SHIPS"

"SEC. 354. (a) Each cargo ship fitted with a radiotelephone installation in accordance with section 356 shall, for safety purposes, carry at least one qualified operator who may

be a member of the crew holding only a certificate for radio telephony."

"(b) Each cargo ship of the United States fitted with a radiotelephone installation in accordance with section 356 shall, while being navigable outside a harbor or port, keep a listening watch in such manner and during such periods as determined by the Commission."

(c) That portion of section 355 of such act, as redesignated hereby, which precedes subsection (b) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS—RADIO-TELEGRAPH EQUIPPED SHIPS"

"SEC. 355. The radio installation and the radio direction finding apparatus required by section 351 of this part shall comply with the following requirements:

"(a) The radio installation shall comprise a main and an emergency or reserve radiotelegraph installation: *Provided*, That, in the case of an existing installation on a cargo ship and a new installation on a cargo ship of 500 gross tons and upward but less than 1,600 gross tons, if the main installation complies with all requirements of an emergency or reserve installation, the emergency or reserve installation may be omitted, except that a separate emergency receiver must, in all cases, be provided."

(d) Such act is amended by inserting, immediately after section 355 thereof, as redesignated hereby, the following new section:

"TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS—RADIO-TELEPHONE EQUIPPED SHIPS"

"SEC. 356. Cargo ships of less than 1,600 gross tons may, in lieu of the radiotelegraph installation prescribed by section 355, carry a radiotelephone installation meeting the following requirements:

"(a) The ship's radiotelephone installation shall be in the upper part of the ship and, unless situated on the bridge, there shall be efficient communication with the bridge."

"(b) The radiotelephone installation shall be capable of transmitting and receiving on the frequencies and with types of emissions designated by the Commission pursuant to law for the purpose of distress and safety of navigation."

"(c) The transmitter shall be capable of transmitting clearly perceptible signals from ship to ship during daytime, under normal conditions and circumstances, over a minimum normal range of 150 nautical miles."

"(d) There shall be available at all times a source of energy sufficient to operate the installation over the normal range required by paragraph (c). If batteries are provided they shall have sufficient capacity to operate the transmitter and receiver for at least 6 hours continuously under normal working conditions. In new installations an emergency source of energy shall be provided in the upper part of the ship unless the main source of energy is so situated."

(e) The text of section 357 of such act, as redesignated hereby, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 357. Every ship required to be provided with lifeboat radio by treaty to which the United States is a party, by statute, or by regulation made in conformity with a treaty, convention, or statute, shall be fitted with efficient radio equipment appropriate to such requirement under such rules and regulations as the Commission may find necessary for safety of life. For purposes of this section, 'radio equipment' shall include portable as well as nonportable apparatus."

(f) Subsection 361 (b) of such act, as redesignated hereby, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Appropriate certificates concerning the radio particulars provided for in said Convention shall be issued upon proper request to any vessel which is subject to the radio provisions of the Safety Convention and is found by the Commission to comply

therewith. Safety radiotelegraphy certificates and safety radiotelephony certificates, as prescribed by the said Convention, and exemption certificates issued in lieu of such certificates, shall be issued by the Commission. Other certificates concerning the radio particulars provided for in the said Convention shall be issued by the Commandant of the Coast Guard or whatever other agency is authorized by law to do so upon request of the Commission made after proper inspection or determination of the facts. If the holder of a certificate violates the radio provisions of the Safety Convention or the provisions of this act, or the rules, regulations or conditions prescribed by the Commission, and if the effective administration of the Safety Convention or of this part so requires, the Commission, after hearing in accordance with law, is authorized to modify or cancel a certificate which it has issued, or to request the modification or cancellation of a certificate which has been issued by another agency upon the Commission's request. Upon receipt of such request for modification or cancellation, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, or whatever agency is authorized by law to do so, shall modify or cancel the certificate in accordance therewith."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(ee) 'Existing installation,' as used in section 355 of this act, means an installation installed on a ship prior to November 19, 1952, in the case of a United States ship subject to the radio provisions of the Safety Convention, or one installed on a ship prior to a date 1 year after the effective date of this subsection in the case of other ships subject to part II of title III of this act."

"(ff) 'New installation,' as used in sections 355 and 356 of this act, means an installation which replaces an existing installation or, in the case of a United States ship subject to the radio provisions of the Safety Convention, one installation a ship subsequent to November 19, 1952, and, in the case of other ships subject to part II of title III of this act, one which is installed subsequent to a date 1 year after the effective date of this subsection."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6427) for the relief of the State of North Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ARMY AND AIR FORCE NURSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9740) to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all payments of longevity pay heretofore made to Army and Air Force nurses for service after April 15, 1947, and before October 1, 1949, are validated to the extent that those payments were based upon service performed by the persons concerned as nurses or as commissioned

officers of the Army Nurse Corps, Navy Nurse Corps, or Public Health Service. Any Army or Air Force nurse who has made a repayment to the United States of the amount so paid to her as longevity pay is entitled to be paid the amount involved, if otherwise proper.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States, or his designee, shall relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents, of the Army and the Air Force from accountability or responsibility for any payments described in section 1 of this act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of those officers or agents for payments which appear to be free from fraud and collusion.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUE QUITCLAIM DEEDS TO STATES FOR CERTAIN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2027) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue quitclaim deeds to States for certain lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue quitclaim deeds to the public-land States for all lands patented to such States under section 4 of the Carey Act of August 18, 1894 (43 U. S. C., sec 641). He shall also issue a patent for all unpatented public lands within each State now segregated under that act for which the State issued final certificates or other evidence of right prior to June 1, 1953, or as to which equitable claims to the lands accrued prior to that date (by reason of cultivation or improvement of the lands for agricultural development purposes) for conveyance to the holders of such rights or claims, or to their heirs, successors, or assigns.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall not issue such quitclaim deeds or patents to any State, however, unless that State files a proper application for the transfer of these lands within 3 years after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. The application must include a list of all the lands which the State certifies should be transferred under the terms of section 1 of this act, the basis for the certification of each tract included, and a quitclaim or relinquishment of all right, title, and interest in the State to any and all other lands under the Carey Act. Such quitclaim or relinquishment by the State shall not affect any private rights obtained from the State prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. The quitclaim or relinquishment of all right, title, and interest by the State to any lands under this act shall not be effective until the Secretary has transferred the lands applied for under section 1 of this act. The Secretary shall provide for the administration and disposition under the public-land laws of the lands quitclaimed or relinquished by the States pursuant to this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT PUBLIC LANDS TO LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3302) granting to the Las Vegas Valley Water District, a public corporation organized under the laws of the State of Nevada,

certain public lands of the United States in the State of Nevada.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the Las Vegas Valley Water District, a public corporation organized under the laws of the State of Nevada, all lands belonging to the United States situated in Clark County, State of Nevada, which may be necessary, as found by the Secretary of the Interior, for the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for the development, production, storage, transmission, and distribution of water, including any or all of the following purposes:

Rights-of-way; buildings and structures; construction and maintenance camps; dumping grounds, flowage, diverting, or storage dams; pumping plants; canals; ditches; pipes, pipelines, flumes, tunnels, and conduits for conveying water for domestic, irrigation, household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other useful purposes; poles, towers, underground conduits, lines, and equipment for the conveyance and distribution of electrical energy; poles, underground conduits, and lines for telephone and telegraph purposes; roads, trails, bridges, tramways, railroads, and other means of locomotion, transmission, or communication; for obtaining stone, earth, gravel, and other materials of like character; or any other necessary purposes of said grantee, together with the right to take for its own use, from any public lands, within such limits as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, stone, earth, gravel, sand, and other materials of like character necessary or useful in the construction, operation, and maintenance of aqueducts, reservoirs, dams, pumping plants, electric transmission, telephone, and telegraph lines, roads, trails, bridges, tramways, railroads, and other means of locomotion, transmission, and communication, or any other necessary purposes of said grantee.

That there is hereby excepted and reserved unto the United States, from said grants, minerals, other than sand, stone, earth, gravel, and other materials of like character: *Provided, however,* That such minerals so excepted and reserved shall be prospected for, mined, and removed only in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

This grant shall be effective upon (1) the filing by said grantee at any time after the passage of this act, with the manager of the United States local land office in the district where said lands are situated, of a map or maps showing the boundaries, locations, and extent of said lands and of said rights-of-way for the purposes hereinabove set forth; (2) the approval of such map or maps by the Secretary of the Interior with such reservations or modifications as he may deem appropriate; (3) the payment of a price representing the fair market value for said rights-of-way and other lands, and also for stone, earth, sand, gravel and other materials of like character, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior through appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands by the grantee or its predecessors, or a reasonable rental, as the case may be: *Provided,* That said lands for rights-of-way shall be along such location and of such width, not to exceed 250 feet, as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior may be required for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 2. Said grants are to be made subject to rights-of-way, easements, and permits heretofore granted or allowed to any person or corporation in accordance with any act or acts of Congress and subject to the rights of all claimants or persons who shall have filed or made valid claims, locations, or entries on or to said lands, or any part

thereof prior to the effective date of any conflicting grant hereunder, unless prior to such effective date proper relinquishments or quitclaims have been procured and caused to be filed in the proper land office.

SEC. 3. That, whenever the land granted herein shall cease to be used for the purposes for which it is granted, the estate of the grantee or of its assigns shall terminate and revert in the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "purposes" and insert "purposes only to the extent required for such development, production, storage, transmission, and distribution of water."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPACT BY LOUISIANA AND TEXAS RELATING TO SABINE RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3699) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Louisiana and Texas and relating to the waters of the Sabine River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation of what this bill proposes?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There are two bills, one a House bill and the other a Senate bill, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa. This is a compact between the States of Louisiana and Texas regarding the Sabine River. A report has been submitted to the Congress by the Army Engineers. There is no expenditure of public funds involved.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to the interstate compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River and its tributaries authorized by the act of November 1, 1951 (Public Law No. 252, 82d Cong., 1st sess.), which was signed by the representatives for the States of Louisiana and Texas and approved by the representative of the United States, at Logansport, La., on January 26, 1953, and thereafter ratified and approved by the Legislatures of the States of Louisiana and Texas, which compact reads as follows:

SABINE RIVER COMPACT

The State of Texas and the State of Louisiana, parties signatory to this compact (hereinafter referred to as "Texas" and "Louisiana," respectively, or individually as a "State," or collectively as the "States"), having resolved to conclude a compact with respect to the waters of the Sabine River, and having appointed representatives as follows:

For Texas: Henry L. Woodworth, interstate compact commissioner for Texas; and John W. Simmons, president of the Sabine River Authority of Texas;

For Louisiana: Roy T. Sessums, director of the Department of Public Works of the State of Louisiana;

and consent to negotiate and enter into the said compact having been granted by

act of Congress of the United States approved November 1, 1951 (Public Law No. 252; 82d Cong., 1st sess.), and pursuant thereto the President having designated Louis W. Prentiss as the representative of the United States, the said representatives for Texas and Louisiana, after negotiations participated in by the representative of the United States, have for such compact agreed upon articles as hereinafter set forth. The major purposes of this compact are to provide for an equitable apportionment between the States of Louisiana and Texas of the waters of the Sabine River and its tributaries, thereby removing the causes of present and future controversy between the States over the conservation and utilization of said waters; to encourage the development, conservation and utilization of the water resources of the Sabine River and its tributaries; and to establish a basis for cooperative planning and action by the States for the construction, operation and maintenance of projects for water conservation and utilization purposes on that reach of the Sabine River touching both States, and for apportionment of the benefits therefrom.

It is recognized that pollution abatement and salt water intrusion are problems which are of concern to the States of Louisiana and Texas, but inasmuch as this compact is limited to the equitable apportionment of the waters of the Sabine River and its tributaries between the States of Louisiana and Texas, this compact does not undertake the solution of those problems.

ARTICLE I

As used in this compact:

(a) The word "stateline" means the point of the Sabine River where its waters in downstream flow first touch the States of both Louisiana and Texas.

(b) The term "waters of the Sabine River" means the waters either originating in the natural drainage basin of the Sabine River, or appearing as streamflow in said river and its tributaries, from its headwater source down to the mouth of the river where it enters into Sabine Lake.

(c) The term "stateline flow" means the flow of waters of the Sabine River as determined by the Logansport gage located on the U. S. Highway 84, approximately 4 river miles downstream from the stateline. This flow, or the flow as determined by such substitute gaging station as may be established by the administration, as hereinafter defined, pursuant to the provisions of article VII of this compact, shall be deemed the actual stateline flow.

(d) The term "stateline reach" means that portion of the Sabine River lying between the stateline and Sabine Lake.

(e) The term "the administration" means the Sabine River Compact Administration established under article VII.

(f) The term "domestic use" means the use of water by an individual, or by a family unit or household for drinking, cooking, laundering, sanitation, and other personal comforts and necessities; and for the irrigation of an area not to exceed 1 acre, obtained directly from the Sabine River or its tributaries by an individual or family unit, not supplied by a water company, water district or municipality.

(g) The term "stock water use" means the use of water for any and all livestock and poultry.

(h) The term "consumptive use" means use of water resulting in its permanent removal from the stream.

(i) The terms "domestic" and "stock water" reservoir" mean any reservoir for either or both of such uses having a storage capacity of 50 acre-feet or less.

(j) "Stored water" means water stored in reservoirs (exclusive of domestic or stock water reservoirs) or water withdrawn or released from reservoirs for specific uses and the identifiable return flow from such uses.

(k) The term "free water" means all waters other than "stored waters" in the stateline reach including, but not limited to, that appearing as natural streamflow and not withdrawn or released from a reservoir for specific uses. Waters released from reservoirs for the purpose of maintaining streamflows as provided in article V, shall be "free water." All reservoir spills or releases of stored waters made in anticipation of spills, shall be free water.

(l) Where the name of the State or the term "State" is used in this compact, it shall be construed to include any person or entity of any nature whatsoever of the States of Louisiana or Texas using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Sabine River under the authority of that State.

(m) Wherever any State or Federal official or agency is referred to in this compact, such reference shall apply equally to the comparable official or agency succeeding to their duties and functions.

ARTICLE II

Subject to the provisions of article X, nothing in this compact shall be construed as applying to, or interfering with, the right or power of either signatory State to regulate within its boundaries the appropriation, use and control of water, not inconsistent with its obligations under this compact.

ARTICLE III

Subject to the provisions of article X, all rights to any of the waters of the Sabine River which have been obtained in accordance with the laws of the States are hereby recognized and affirmed; provided, however, that withdrawals, from time to time, for the satisfaction of such rights, shall be subject to the availability of supply in accordance with the apportionment of water provided under the terms of this compact.

ARTICLE IV

Texas shall have free and unrestricted use of all waters of the Sabine River and its tributaries above the State line subject, however, to the provisions of articles V and X.

ARTICLE V

Texas and Louisiana hereby agree upon the following apportionment of the waters of the Sabine River:

(a) All free water in the State line reach shall be divided equally between the two States, this division to be made without reference to the origin.

(b) The necessity of maintaining a minimum flow at the State line for the benefit of water users below the State line in both States is recognized, and to this end it is hereby agreed that:

(1) Reservoirs and permits above the State line existing as of January 1, 1953, shall not be liable for maintenance of the flow at the State line.

(2) After January 1, 1953, neither State shall permit or authorize any additional users which would have the effect of reducing the flow at the State line to less than 36 cubic feet per second.

(3) Reservoirs on which construction is commenced after January 1, 1953, above the State line shall be liable for their share of water necessary to provide a minimum flow at the State line of 36 cubic feet per second; provided, that no reservoir shall be liable for a greater percentage of this minimum flow than the percentage of the drainage area above the State line contributing to that reservoir, exclusive of the watershed of any reservoir on which construction was started prior to January 1, 1953. Water released from Texas' reservoirs to establish the minimum flow of 36 cubic feet per second, shall be classed as free water at the State line and divided equally between the two States.

(c) The right of each State to construct impoundment reservoirs and other works of

improvement on the Sabine River or its tributaries located wholly within its boundaries is hereby recognized.

(d) In the event that either State constructs reservoir storage on the tributaries below State line after January 1, 1953, there shall be deducted from that State's share of the flow in the Sabine River all reductions in flow resulting from the operation of the tributary storage and conversely such State shall be entitled to the increased flow resulting from the regulation provided by such storage.

(e) Each State shall have the right to use the main channel of the Sabine River to convey water stored on the Sabine River or its tributaries located wholly within its boundaries, downstream to a desired point of removal without loss of ownership of such stored waters. In the event that such water is released by a State through the natural channel of a tributary and the channel of the Sabine River to a downstream point of removal, a reduction shall be made in the amount of water which can be withdrawn at the point of removal equal to the transmission losses.

(f) Each State shall have the right to withdraw its share of the water from the channel of the Sabine River in the State line reach in accordance with article VII. Neither State shall withdraw at any point more than its share of the flow at that point except, that pursuant to findings and determination of the Administration as provided under article VII of this compact, either State may withdraw more or less of its share of the water at any point providing that its aggregate withdrawal shall not exceed its total share. Withdrawals made pursuant to this paragraph shall not prejudice or impair the existing rights of users of Sabine River waters.

(g) Waters stored in reservoirs constructed by the States in the State line reach shall be shared by each State in proportion to its contribution to the cost of storage. Neither State shall have the right to construct a dam on the State line reach without the consent of the other State.

(h) Each State may vary the rate and manner of withdrawal of its share of such jointly stored waters on the State line reach, subject to meeting the obligations for amortization of the cost of the joint storage. In any event, neither State shall withdraw more than its pro rata share in any one year (a year meaning a water year, October 1 to September 30) except by authority of the Administration. All jointly stored water remaining at the end of a water year shall be reapportioned between the States in the same proportion as their contribution to the cost of the storage.

(i) Except for jointly stored water, as provided in (h) above, each State must use its apportionment of the natural stream flows as they occur and there shall be no allowance of accumulation of credits or debits for or against either State. The failure of either State to use the streamflow or any part thereof, the use of which is apportioned to it under the terms of this compact, shall not constitute a relinquishment of the right to such use in the future; conversely, the failure of either State to use the water at the time it is available does not give it the right to the flow in excess of its share of the flow at any other time.

(j) From the apportionment of waters of the Sabine River as defined in this article, there shall be excluded from such apportionment all waters consumed in either State for domestic and stock water uses. Domestic and stock water reservoirs shall be so excluded.

(k) Each State may use its share of the water apportioned to it in any manner that may be deemed beneficial by that State.

ARTICLE VI

(a) The States through their respective appropriate agencies of subdivisions may construct jointly, or cooperate with any agency or instrumentality of the United States in the construction of works on the State line reach for the development, conservation and utilization for all beneficial purposes of the waters of the Sabine River.

(b) All monetary revenues growing out of any joint State ownership, title and interest in works constructed under Section (a) above, and accruing to the States in respect thereof, shall be divided between the States in proportion to their respective contributions to the cost of construction; provided, however, that each State shall retain undivided all its revenues from recreational facilities within its boundaries incidental to the use of the waters of the Sabine River, and from its severally State-owned recreational facilities constructed appurtenant thereto.

(c) All operation and maintenance costs chargeable against any joint State ownership, title and interest in works constructed under section (a) above, shall be assessed in proportion to the contribution of each State to the original cost of construction.

ARTICLE VII

(a) There is hereby created an interstate administrative agency to be designated as the "Sabine River Compact Administration" herein referred to as "the Administration".

(b) The Administration shall consist of 2 members from each State and of 1 member as representative of the United States, chosen by the President of the United States, who is hereby requested to appoint such a representative. The United States member shall be ex-officio chairman of the Administration without vote and shall not be a domiciliary of or reside in either State. The appointed members for Texas and Louisiana shall be designated within 30 days after the effective date of this compact.

(c) The Texas members shall be appointed by the Governor for a term of 2 years; provided, that 1 of the original Texas members shall be appointed for a term to establish a half-term interval between the expiration dates of the terms of such members, and thereafter one such member shall be appointed annually for the regular term. One of the Louisiana members shall be ex-officio the Director of the Louisiana Department of Public Works; the other Louisiana member shall be a resident of the Sabine Watershed and shall be appointed by the Governor of Louisiana for a term of 4 years; provided, that the first member so appointed shall serve until June 30, 1958. Each State member shall hold office subject to the laws of his State or until his successor has been duly appointed and qualified.

(d) Interim vacancy, for whatever cause, in the office of any member of the Administration shall be filled for the unexpired term in the same manner as hereinabove provided for regular appointment.

(e) Within 60 days after the effective date of this compact, the Administration shall meet and organize. A quorum for any meeting shall consist of 3 voting members of the Administration. Each State member shall have 1 vote, and every decision, authorization, determination, order or other action shall require the concurring votes of at least 3 members.

(f) The Administration shall have power to:

(1) Adopt, amend and revoke bylaws, rules and regulations, and prescribe procedures for administration of and consistent with the provisions of this compact.

(2) Fix and determine from time to time the location of the Administration's principal office;

(3) Employ such engineering, legal, clerical and other personnel, without regard to the

civil service laws of either State, as the Administration may determine necessary or proper to supplement State-furnished assistance as hereinafter provided, for the performance of its functions under this compact; provided, that such employee shall be paid by and be responsible to the Administration and shall not be considered to be employees of either State;

(4) Procure such equipment, supplies and technical assistance as the Administration may determine to be necessary or proper to supplement State-furnished assistance as herein after provided, for the performance of its functions under this compact;

(5) Adopt a seal which shall be judicially recognized.

(g) In cooperation with the chief official administering water rights in each State and with appropriate Federal agencies, the Administration shall have and perform powers and duties as follows:

(1) To collect, analyze, correlate, compile and report on data as to water supplies, stream flows, storage, diversions, salvage and use of the waters of the Sabine River and its tributaries, and as to all factual data necessary or proper for the administration of this compact;

(2) To designate as official stations for the administration of this compact such existing water gaging stations (and to operate, maintain, repair and abandon the same), and to locate, establish, construct, operate, maintain, repair and abandon additional such stations, as the Administration may from time to time find and determine necessary or appropriate;

(3) To make findings as to the deliveries of water at State line, as hereinabove provided, from the streamflow records of the State line gage which shall be operated and maintained by the administration or in cooperation with the appropriate Federal agency, for determination of the actual State line flow unless the administration shall find and determine that, because of changed physical conditions or for any other reason, reliable records are not obtainable thereat; in which case such existing State line station may with the approval of the administration be abandoned and, with such approval, a substitute State line station established in lieu thereof;

(4) To make findings as to the quantities of reservoir storage (including joint storage) and releases therefrom, diversions, transmission losses, and as to incident streamflow changes, and as to the share of such quantities chargeable against or allocable to the respective States;

(5) To record and approve all points of diversion at which water is to be removed from the Sabine River or its tributaries below the State line; provided that, in any case, the State agency charged with the administration of the water laws for the State in which such point of diversion is located shall first have approved such point for removal or diversion; provided further that any such point of removal or diversion once jointly approved by the appropriate State agency and the administration, shall not thereafter be changed without the joint amendatory approval of such State agency and the administration;

(6) To require water users at their expense to install and maintain measuring devices of approved type in any ditch, pumping station or other water diversion works on the Sabine River or its tributaries below the State line, as the administration may determine necessary or proper for the purposes of this compact; provided that the chief official of each State charged with the administration of water rights therein shall supervise the execution and enforcement of the administration's requirements for such measuring devices;

(7) To investigate any violations of this compact and to report findings and recom-

mendations thereon to the chief official of the affected State charged with the administration of water rights, or to the Governor of such State as the administration may deem proper;

(8) To acquire, hold, occupy, and utilize such personal and real property as may be necessary or proper for the performance of its duties and functions under this compact;

(9) To perform all functions required of the administration by this compact, and to do all things necessary, proper, or convenient in the performance of its duties hereunder.

(h) Each State shall provide such available facilities, supplies, equipment, technical information, and other assistance as the administration may require to carry out its duties and function, and the execution and enforcement of the administration's orders shall be the responsibility of the agents and officials of the respective States charged with the administration of water rights therein. State officials shall furnish pertinent factual and technical data to the administration upon request.

(i) Findings of fact made by the administration shall not be conclusive in any court or before any agency or tribunal but shall constitute prima facie evidence of such facts.

(j) In the case of a tie vote on any of the administration's determinations, orders, or other actions subject to arbitration, then arbitration shall be a condition precedent to any right of legal action. Either side of a tie vote may, upon request, submit the question to arbitration. If there shall be arbitration, there shall be three arbitrators: 1 named in writing by each side, and the third chosen by the 2 arbitrators so elected. If the arbitrators fail to select a third within 10 days, then he shall be chosen by the representative of the United States.

(k) The salaries, if any, and the personal expenses of each member of the administration, shall be paid by the government which he represents. All other expenses incident to the administration of this compact and which are not paid by the United States shall be borne equally by the States. Ninety days prior to the regular session of the legislature of either State, the administration shall adopt and transmit to the Governor of such State for his approval, its budget covering anticipated expenses for the forthcoming biennium and the amount thereof payable by such State. Upon approval by its Governor, each State shall appropriate and pay the amount due by it to the administration. The administration shall keep an accurate account of all receipts and disbursements and shall include a statement thereof, together with a certificate of audit by a certified public accountant, in its annual report. Each State shall have the right to make an examination and audit of the accounts of the administration at any time.

(l) The administration shall, whenever requested, provide access to its records by the Governor of either State or by the chief official of either State charged therein with the administration of water rights. The administration shall annually on or before January 15 of each year make and transmit to the Governors of the signatory States, and to the President of the United States, a report of the administration's activities and deliberations for the preceding year.

ARTICLE VIII

(a) This compact shall become effective when ratified by the legislature and approved by the Governors of both States and when approved by the Congress of the United States.

(b) The provisions of this compact shall remain in full force and effect until modified, altered, or amended in the same manner as hereinabove required for ratification thereof. The right so to modify, alter, or amend this compact is expressly reserved. This compact

may be terminated at any time by mutual consent of the signatory States. In the event this compact is terminated as herein provided, all rights then vested hereunder shall continue unimpaired.

(c) Should a court of competent jurisdiction hold any part of this compact to be contrary to the constitution of any signatory State or of the United States of America, all other severable provisions of this compact shall continue in full force and effect.

ARTICLE IX

This compact is made and entered into for the sole purpose of effecting an equitable apportionment and providing beneficial uses of the waters of the Sabine River, its tributaries and its watershed, without regard to the boundary between Louisiana and Texas, and nothing herein contained shall be construed as an admission on the part of either State or any agency, commission, department, or subdivision thereof, respecting the location of said boundary; and neither this compact nor any data compiled for the preparation or administration thereof shall be offered, admitted, or considered in evidence, in any dispute, controversy, or litigation bearing upon the matter of the location of said boundary.

The term "State line" as defined in this compact shall not be construed to define the actual boundary between the State of Texas and the State of Louisiana.

ARTICLE X

Nothing in this compact shall be construed as affecting, in any manner, any present or future rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities in, to, and over the waters of the Sabine River Basin.

In witness whereof, the representatives have executed this compact in three counterparts hereof, each of which shall be and constitute an original, one of which shall be forwarded to the Administrator, General Services Administration of the United States of America and one of which shall be forwarded to the Governor of each State.

Done in the city of Logansport, in the State of Louisiana, this 26th day of January 1953.

Henry L. Woodworth

HENRY L. WOODWORTH,

Representative for the State of Texas.

John W. Simmons

JOHN W. SIMMONS,

Representative for the State of Texas.

Roy T. Sessums

ROY T. SESSUMS,

Representative for the State of Texas.

Approved:

Louis W. Prentiss

LOUIS W. PRENTISS,

Representative of the United States.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved. This reservation shall not be construed to prevent the vesting of rights to the use of water pursuant to applicable law, and no alteration, amendment, or repeal of this act shall be held to affect rights so vested.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, S. 3699, granting consent of Congress to a compact between Texas and Louisiana, is a bill introduced by Texas Senators LYNDON B. JOHNSON and PRICE DANIEL and is identical to H. R. 9679, which I

introduced earlier and which was passed out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on July 20, 1954.

This compact, providing a basis for the joint development and improvement of the great Sabine River watershed, was agreed upon by representatives from both Texas, Louisiana, and the United States Government. This fair-minded appropriation of waters and benefits from such development was recognized and the compact approved by the Legislature of the State of Texas and the Legislature of the State of Louisiana. Several days thereafter, H. R. 9679 was introduced.

The ultimate development of the Sabine River will encourage orderly progress and prosperity of the Sabine River watershed in both Louisiana and Texas. With adequate fresh water, there is no limit to the industrial growth of this great area, with its vast resources of natural gas, oil, timber, year-around weather conditions, and fine American citizens. This compact is a major step toward the development of that adequate fresh water supply for east Texas and will point the way to a comprehensive cooperative effort between Texas and Louisiana in improving and developing their tremendous fresh water assets.

Since the Senate has already passed Senate 3699, identical to H. R. 9679, I am going to request the Senate bill having passed the Senate and now having been adopted by the House, that H. R. 9679 be laid on the table.

The Sabine River Authority, its directors, officers, and sponsors, as well as the county officials and leaders in those counties lying within the watershed of the Sabine River, have all worked tirelessly and long in behalf of the project and I would like, at this time, to congratulate the House on its affirmative action encouraging the people of east Texas to continue their efforts to help themselves and thereby make their maximum contribution to the economy, prosperity, and well-being of these great United States.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to lay on the table H. R. 9679, which is a corresponding House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1953, at Logansport, in De Soto Parish, La.—which is in my district—representatives from the States of Louisiana and Texas entered into an agreement or compact between these two States for the development of the Sabine River. This river arises in Texas and, coursing its way southeastward, meets the Louisiana-Texas boundary line at Logansport, Louisiana, thence courses its way to the Gulf of Mexico, forming the western boundary line of the State of Louisiana and the eastern

boundary line of the State of Texas. It empties into the Gulf of Mexico through the Sabine Lake. For this reason, both States are vitally concerned with the development of this river.

Shortly after the compact was signed, the legislature of the State of Texas ratified the agreement. The State of Louisiana on the other hand failed to ratify the compact until three weeks ago when the legislature of Louisiana approved the agreement. The matter, therefore, comes before this committee for action under the Constitution of the United States, which authorizes Congress to approve interstate compacts.

On July 21, 1953, I introduced H. R. 6439, a bill to approve this compact. At that time, the State of Louisiana had not voted upon the agreement. The State of Texas had, however, already ratified it, and I introduced this bill for the purpose of presenting the matter to Congress and letting the people in both States have the opportunity of knowing what was occurring before the agreement was formally ratified. The legislature of Louisiana has just approved the agreement and it is now ready for ratification.

The Sabine River is one of the large rivers of the Southwest. At one time, it was navigable to what is now Logansport, and was an important artery of commerce. In recent years, there has been no use of this stream for navigation purposes up this far. Logansport, however, is in the congressional district which it is my privilege to represent in Congress, and I hope that by virtue of this compact ways will be found ultimately to make the river navigable again and restore waterborne commerce to the Sabine Valley in both Texas and Louisiana.

President Eisenhower made a strong statement recently at the National Rivers and Harbors Congress of which I am president, emphasizing the extreme importance of the proper use of our water resources. The water of the Sabine River will be made available by virtue of this compact for irrigation purposes. In both States at times the need of irrigation is extremely great. In north Louisiana during dry crop years, water is badly needed to prevent crop failures. In south Louisiana rice farmers are in need of water for irrigating rice. This crop, grown extensively in southwest Louisiana, needs a complete inundation of water to the extent of 3 or 4 inches for a number of weeks during each crop season. During this period, water must be taken from neighboring streams and used to cover the young rice plants completely. Reasonable use of water from the Sabine River will make possible for more extensive cultivation of rice and other crops, and will add greatly to the development of this section.

A year and one month after I had introduced my bill, H. R. 6439, my colleague from the State of Texas introduced the identical bill for the same purpose. This bill was identical to mine with three exceptions, all of which changes were made for the purpose of showing that the State of Louisiana had formally approved the Sabine compact agreement and that it was then ready

for submission to the United States Congress.

Both of these bills were presented to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. In the meantime, a Senate bill by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, has been introduced, and following the approval by the State of Louisiana of the compact agreement, this bill has passed the Senate.

In Louisiana, especially this portion of the State is a part which has been neglected in the course of its normal development. Properly laid plans supported by the two States, looking toward long-range improvements, may do much toward giving value to the lands, development to its industry, and make available a prosperous condition to the extent not heretofore seen in this section of the Southwest. I hope that the States of Texas and Louisiana will seize upon the opportunities presented by this compact. With proper planning and proper development the western part of Louisiana and the eastern part of Texas can be made to bloom like a rose. Fields now discarded as not tillable will be made to produce prolifically with proper handling of water from the Sabine watershed. Cotton, corn, oats, and cane can all use more abundant water supply at appropriate times in their cultivation. The cattle industry will get a boon from use of Sabine water. This new industry recently brought into Louisiana from Western States provides a variety for our agricultural program and an abundant supply of water for use by cattle is imperative. The area along the western side of the State will really profit by proper handling of this major problem.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason I, a Representative from the State of Louisiana, earnestly urge that this Congress pass this bill unanimously and that it go to the President for his signature within the next few days.

TEMPORARY RETIREMENT INCREASE MADE PERMANENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7785) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to make permanent the increases in regular annuities provided by the act of July 16, 1952, and to extend such increases to additional annuities purchased by voluntary contributions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I would like to inquire of someone from the committee what the purpose of this bill is.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this bill is to make permanent the increase in civil-service retirement annuities provided by Public Law 555, 82d Congress, which was enacted July 16, 1952. This public law granted a temporary increase that has been extended from year to year and will expire June 30, 1955, unless this bill is passed. The increase provided applies to all annuities of \$2,160 or less which are increased by 25 percent, or \$324, whichever is the lesser. Under Public Law 555 the \$2,160

ceiling included annuity purchased by voluntary contributions. This bill bases the \$2,160 ceiling on the regular annuity only. However, the increase is computed on both the regular annuity and the annuity purchased by voluntary contributions. All increases provided by this bill are to be paid from the civil-service retirement and disability fund.

Section 3 of the bill is to bring the widow of a former longtime legislative employee under the provisions of Public Law 303, 83d Congress. This widow is the only person that will be benefited. Public Law 303 became effective on April 1, 1954. The legislative employee that I refer to died on March 7, 1954, after the bill that later became Public Law 303 had been passed by both the House and Senate, but before it went into effect. Section 3 of H. R. 7785 advances the effective date of Public Law 303 to March 6, 1954.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 (c) (1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting the first proviso therein the following: "Provided further, That in any case where a retired employee is receiving an annuity computed as provided in section 4 and an annuity purchased by voluntary contributions under the second paragraph of section 10, the increase granted by this subsection shall be computed separately with respect to each such annuity, except that the aggregate increase in such present annuities shall not exceed the lesser of \$324 or 25 percent of the total of such present annuities."

SEC. 2. Section 8 (c) (2) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The increases in annuity provided by this subsection shall be paid from the civil-service retirement and disability fund."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

(1) Page 1, line 3, strike out beginning with the word "That" down through the period in line 3 on page 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 8 (c) (1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out the first and second provisos therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That such increase in annuity shall not exceed the smallest of the following amounts:

(1) \$324, (2) 25 percent of the annuity, including annuity purchased by voluntary contributions under the second paragraph of section 10 of this act, as of August 31, 1952, or (3) the sum necessary to increase such annuity, exclusive of annuity purchased by voluntary contributions under the second paragraph of section 10 of this act, to \$2,160."

(2) Page 2, line 10 strike out beginning with "SEC. 3." down through the period in line 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. The amendment to section 12 (c) (1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, made by the act of March 6, 1954, shall take effect as of March 6, 1954.

"SEC. 4. Except as provided in section 3 hereof, the amendments made by this act shall take effect on the first day of the sec-

ond calendar month following the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATENTS IN FEE TO MISSION INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8365) to confirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to allotments of lands of the Mission Indians in the State of California prior to the expiration of the trust period specified in the act of January 12, 1891, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the provisions of the act approved February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes," and all acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, insofar as they have not hitherto been applicable, shall apply to patents in fee simple heretofore issued or hereafter to be issued under the act for the relief of the Mission Indians in the State of California, approved January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. 712), as amended or supplemented.

(b) All patents in fee simple heretofore issued covering lands allotted under said act approved January 12, 1891, as amended or supplemented, are hereby ratified, confirmed and declared valid from the respective dates of such issuance, even though such patents might have been issued prior to the expiration of the trust period existing with respect to a trust patent.

(c) All conveyances heretofore made by patentees of lands included in fee simple patents heretofore issued covering lands allotted under said act approved January 12, 1891, as amended or supplemented, are hereby ratified, confirmed, approved, and declared valid, to the same extent as though this act had been in full force and effect at the time of the issuance of such patents.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS FOR CATOCTIN RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION AREA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8821) to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Catoctin recreational demonstration area, Frederick County, Md., for the purposes of consolidating Federal holdings therein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings of land acquired for the Catoctin recreational demonstration area, Frederick County, Md., is hereby empowered, in his discretion, to obtain for the United States land and interests in lands held in private ownership within the established watersheds and boundaries of said recreational demonstration area by accepting from the owners of such privately owned land

complete relinquishment thereof, and the Secretary may grant to such owners in exchange therefor, in each instance, federally owned lands of approximately equal value now a part of the Catoctin recreational demonstration area, that he considers are not essential for the administration, control, and operation of the aforesaid recreational demonstration area. Any land acquired by the United States pursuant to this authorization shall become a part of the Catoctin recreational demonstration area upon the vesting of title in the United States, and shall be subject to the laws applicable thereto.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLES 18 AND 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9821) to amend titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is to provide for orderly termination of Federal supervision over the property and members of the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin.

Sec. 2. Section 1162, title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking therefrom the words "except the Menominee Reservation" and the comma preceding those words.

Sec. 3. Section 1360, title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking therefrom the words "except the Menominee Reservation" and the comma preceding those words.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 1162, title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking therefrom the words 'except the Menominee Reservation' and the comma preceding those words."

"Sec. 2. Section 1360, title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking therefrom the words 'except the Menominee Reservation' and the comma preceding those words."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENEWAL OF STAR ROUTE AND SCREEN VEHICLE SERVICE CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1244) relating to the renewal of star route and screen vehicle service contracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the lady from New York or someone from the committee explain the purpose of the bill and its necessity?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced at the instance of the star route carriers. Under the present law, the Government may, in its discretion and in the interest of the postal service, in all cases of regular contracts, continue in force beyond its express terms for a period not exceeding 6 months. Where the contractor dies during the last 6 months of the contract, the 6

months' extension will not meet the present 1-year qualification.

This measure will give the same protection to subcontractors, who are in very many cases widows of deceased contractors, in cases where the contractor dies during the last 6 months of his contract.

This bill is also approved by the Post Office Department, and we have a letter to that effect. It is also approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and it will not increase expenses. The interest of our committee was particularly attracted toward it in that it would be of particular assistance and help to the widows of some contractors.

Mr. ASPINALL. Your committee reported it unanimously?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Unanimously, yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the next to last paragraph of section 3951 of the revised statutes, as amended (39 U. S. C. 434) is amended by striking out the words "one year" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "6 months."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF WATERBORNE CARGOES IN UNITED STATES-FLAG VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3233) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide permanent legislation for the transportation of a substantial portion of waterborne cargoes in United States-flag vessels.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Commerce Department does not recommend enactment of this bill and requests that a study of the bill be made. The Budget concurs in the views of the Commerce Department. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

COMPENSATION RECEIVED IN VIOLATION OF THE DUAL COMPENSATION LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5718) to limit the period for collection by the United States of compensation received by officers and employees in violation of the dual compensation laws.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby waives all claims against any person arising out of the receipt by such person of compensation from the United States including Government owned or controlled corporations or from the government of the District of Columbia in violation of any provision of law prohibiting or restricting the receipt of dual compensation, which has not been reported to the General Accounting

Office for collection within 6 years from the last date of any period of dual compensation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO VICKSBURG, MISS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9194) to provide for the conveyance of certain land owned by the Federal Government near Vicksburg, Miss., to Vicksburg, Miss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey, for and in consideration of \$3,500 to the city of Vicksburg, Miss., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land, comprising approximately one and nine hundred fourteen one-thousandths acres (including accretions thereto, and any riparian rights appurtenant to such land) near the city of Vicksburg, Miss., more particularly described as parcels 1 and 2 as shown on an official map of the United States Department of the Interior, identified as "Drawing No. NMP-VIC, 2028-A," dated August 15, 1951, and consisting of four sheets carrying such identification.

Sec. 2. Funds obtained by the Secretary of the Interior from the conveyance of the land described in the first section of this act shall be retained in a special fund and may be used by him, without further authority, for the procurement by purchase only of additional property for the Vicksburg National Military Park within the limits of the park as authorized by the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "\$3,500" and insert "an amount equal to the reasonable appraised value thereof as determined by the Secretary."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLACK CANYON IRRIGATION DISTRICT, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9630) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory contract with the Black Canyon Irrigation District, Idaho, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] or some member of his committee about this bill? I notice the Department of the Interior recommends enactment. The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the enactment. However, the question of the practicability of extending irrigation payments over an 86-year period has arisen. This bill extends payments over an 86-year period. Does not the gentleman think that is too long, and that it is too controversial a bill to be passed by unanimous consent?

Mr. BUDGE. In answer to the inquiry, the situation is simply this: The

Reclamation Act has been on the books now for some 50 years. There are a number of projects throughout the United States where for one reason or another the repayment has not been able to progress as rapidly as it was originally believed by the Bureau of Reclamation it would be. This does not happen to be in my congressional district but in the congressional district of my colleague from Idaho, but I am somewhat familiar with it. It simply is entering into a new contract, which is all the Federal Government is going to collect back from the people on the project. Unless a new contract is entered into the Federal investment, which has already been made and which is the debt which is owed the Federal Government, will have to be written off the books. This is the only way the Federal Government can get its money back.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I ask the gentleman this question: Is an 86-year period for the repayment unusual, or is it customary?

Mr. BUDGE. It is unusual. This relates only to the districts where for some reason or other there was difficulty in repayment. In many instances the Bureau of Reclamation made mistakes in the cost of the project and made mistakes in the amount of the water that would be available for the project. These things were built years ago. It just boils down to the fact that the Federal Government either collects its money over a longer period of years or else writes it off. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly anxious that this bill pass, because it is of vital importance to my friends and neighbors in my home county of Canyon in Idaho. I have just talked with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] and he has agreed to withdraw his objection made earlier. He now realizes that many farmers of the Black Canyon Irrigation District stand to lose their farms and their life's possessions if they are not given relief from the present heavy water assessment charges.

The Black Canyon Irrigation District is an old, well-established one. The original contract of October 1927 provided for the repayment of all irrigation costs by the water users. Since that time new requirements for power, flood control and irrigation have made necessary the reallocation of the project costs. Costs to water users have risen accordingly. This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory contract which provides an economically sound adjustment.

The lands represented by the Black Canyon Irrigation District are in two divisions. The first contains 6,880 acres, and the second 53,000 acres. The pro-

posed amendatory contract leaves unchanged the remaining construction obligations payable by the water users in the First Division, and calls for the repayment of the remaining sum due the Government in 8 to 9 years. The construction obligation of the second unit is established by the contract at \$7,346,815, with annual payments of \$85,120. This will pay back the total cost of the second unit in 86 years.

These amounts are within the water users' ability to pay and at the same time are about as much as can be recovered under a fair and equitable contract. So as you can see the bill has the double objective of keeping the Government from losing money, and a number of farmers from losing their farms and homes. I am glad that it will now pass the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GAVIN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9397) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer to the Panama Canal Company, without exchange of funds, all or so much of the facilities, buildings, structures, improvements, and equipment comprising aids to navigation maintained by the Coast Guard at or on Roncador Cay, Serrana Banks, Quita Sueno Banks, Cristobal Mole, Cape Mala, Jicarita Island, and Morro Puercos Island, as may be mutually acceptable for transfer.

SEC. 2. Upon completion of any transfer authorized by this act, the functions of the Treasury Department concerning the pertinent aid to navigation and its jurisdiction over the side upon which the aid is located or transferred to the Panama Canal Company.

SEC. 3. Transfers made under this act shall be subject to the provisions of section 246 (b) of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as added by the act of June 29, 1948 (ch. 706, sec. 2, 62 Stat. 1076).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "side" and insert "site."

At the end of the bill, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "except so far as said section would require payment to be made for the transferred property and assets."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VINELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, KERN COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 550) to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a thirty-six and seven hundred and fifty-nine one thousandths acre tract to the Vineland School Dis-

trict of the county of Kern, State of California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolutions, as follows:

Whereas by quitclaim deed dated November 28, 1947, and recorded on December 10, 1947, in book 1341 of official records, page 424, in the office of the county recorder, Kern County, Calif., the United States of America granted to the Vineland School District, Bakersfield, county of Kern, State of California, a tract of land containing thirty-six and seven hundred and fifty-nine one-thousandths acres, more or less, together with the improvements and appurtenances, for use in maintaining and operating said property for public use as a public school; and

Whereas said quitclaim deed dated November 28, 1947, contains a provision for reversion of said property to the United States of America if the property ceases to be used for the purposes for which it was granted; and

Whereas the Vineland School District is making application to the State of California for a loan to construct further improvements and additions to the school buildings now located on said tract and it is necessary for the Vineland School District to secure a release of the aforementioned reversionary rights in order to obtain the loan; and

Whereas the United States of America holds an undivided interest in said reversionary rights and the director of the California State Department of Agriculture, as successor to the assets of the California Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, acting pursuant to the provisions of chapter 414, Laws of California, 1949, as amended by chapter 1179, Laws of California, 1951, and chapter 141, Laws of California, 1953, holds an undivided beneficial interest in said reversionary rights; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States is presently administering and holds title, as trustee, to the assets of the California Rural Rehabilitation Corporation under an agreement dated April 19, 1953, entered into between the United States of America and the director of the California State Department of Agriculture pursuant to the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act (Public Law 499, 81st Cong.; 40 U. S. C. 440): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That, upon the written consent of the director of the California State Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States is authorized and directed to convey, for a consideration of \$1, by quitclaim deed to the Vineland School District, Bakersfield, county of Kern, State of California, and its successors and assigns, all of the right, title, and interest reserved or retained by the quitclaim deed from the United States of America to the aforesaid Vineland School District dated November 28, 1947, covering thirty-six and seven hundred and fifty-nine one-thousandths acres, more or less, and recorded on December 10, 1947, in book 1341 of official records, page 424, in the office of the county recorder, Kern County, Calif.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the title down to the resolving clause on page 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERCHANT MARINE CHAPEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9115) to provide that contributions received

under Public Law 485, 80th Congress, for the construction of a merchant marine chapel shall be invested in Government obligations pending their use for such construction.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That funds accepted under Public Law 485, 80th Congress, as contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction of the chapel provided for in that act shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States, until such funds are needed for the purpose for which they were contributed. The yield obtained from such investments shall be considered to be a part of such funds.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8666) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Territory of Alaska is authorized and empowered, notwithstanding any provision of the Organic Act of Alaska or any other act of Congress to the contrary, to borrow on the credit of the Territory from time to time such sums as may be necessary for public improvements including, without limitation, constructing, altering, and equipping schools, hospitals, colleges, offices, prisons, and other public buildings, and roads, water and sewer systems, wharves, docks, bridges, and other public facilities, and to issue therefor at such rates of interest as may be prescribed by Territorial law, negotiable bonds, the face amount thereof not to exceed \$10,000,000 outstanding at any one time. The faith of the Territory shall be solemnly pledged to the payment of all such debts.

Sec. 2. No such debt shall be contracted unless it shall be authorized by Territorial law for each public improvement to be distinctly specified therein. No such debt shall be contracted for a period longer than the probable life of the work or purpose for which the debt is to be contracted. A determination of such probable life provided by either a special or general law of the Territory in effect at the time the debt is contracted shall be conclusive.

Sec. 3. The bonds shall be serial bonds payable in annual installments, the first of any issue of which shall be payable not more than three years, and the last of which shall be payable before or upon the expiration of said probable life of the work or purpose but in no case more than thirty years, from the date of issue. Such bonds shall be sold at not less than their face amount, plus accrued interest. The privilege of paying all or any part of such obligations prior to the date on which the same shall be due shall be reserved to the Territory in such manner as may be prescribed by the laws authorizing the same. The Territorial Legislature may provide means and authority whereby any such debt may be refunded, in accordance with the privilege reserved to pay the same prior to the date payable, any such refunded debt to be payable in installments not less in amount than the installments provided in the debt so refunded.

Sec. 4. The obligations herein authorized shall be in such form or forms and denomination or denominations and subject to such

terms and conditions of issue, conversion, redemption, maturities, and payment as may be prescribed by the laws authorizing the same, and shall be offered for sale on a competitive basis.

Sec. 5. The Territorial Legislature shall provide in the law authorizing any such debt or the issuance of any such obligations, and thereafter, for the payment of interest upon and installments of principal as the same shall fall due, by the levy of a tax sufficient therefor or otherwise, and appropriation therefor. If at any time the appropriation for payment of any such debt shall be insufficient, the Treasurer shall set apart from the first revenues thereafter received, applicable to the general funds of the Territory, such sum as may be sufficient for any such payment and make such payment on such debt.

Sec. 6. The Territory of Alaska is authorized and empowered, notwithstanding any provision of the organic act or any other act of Congress to the contrary, to borrow, in accordance with Territorial law providing therefor, such sums as may be necessary for emergencies, not to exceed a total at any time of \$200,000 and within the limitation hereinabove provided, when the legislature is not in session and when Territorial funds are not appropriated or available therefor, and to issue therefor at not less than par and at not more than the commercial interest rate, certificates of indebtedness, which shall be payable at such time, not later than one month subsequent to the date of convening of the succeeding regular session of the legislature, as the Territorial treasurer or other officer designated by such law may prescribe, subject to redemption prior to maturity. The term "emergencies" as used herein shall be defined by Territorial law and the Governor shall be empowered to apply, and shall determine the application of, such definition. The faith of the Territory shall be solemnly pledged to the payment of such certificates.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike all of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Page 3, line 22, strike the words "Sec. 6. The" and insert in lieu thereof the words "That the."

Page 4, lines 2 and 3, strike the words "at any time of \$200,000 and within the limitation herein above provided," and insert in lieu thereof the words "sum of \$200,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAWAIIAN EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7569) to authorize the removal of a restrictive covenant on land patent No. 9628, issued to the board of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association on January 18, 1929, and covering lots 5 and 6 of Waimea town lots, situated in the county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii, with the consent of the Governor of said Territory of Hawaii, be authorized to remove the following restriction contained in land patent No. 9628, so that the lands will be free of any such encumbrance:

"The land herein conveyed is sold subject to the condition that same is to be used for church and/or school purposes only, and in

the event of its being used for other than church and/or school purposes, this patent will immediately become void and the title to the whole of said land together with the improvements thereon shall without warrant or other legal process, immediately revert to and revert in the Territory of Hawaii."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION AT CHILOQUIN, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7290) to authorize an appropriation for the construction of certain public-school facilities on the Klamath Indian Reservation at Chiloquin, Oreg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to inquire what the policy is with respect to participating in the construction of schools insofar as these places near Indian reservations are concerned. It is my understanding, for instance, in Wisconsin if they are near a school district, the Government pays the school district a tuition fee for their students, but the Government does not construct the schools; or in other cases, they build the school for the Indians on the reservation. It seems to me to be rather peculiar policy to go in and build a public school building.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is a little bit different. Ordinarily, the Federal Government constructs the schools themselves. However, in the case where the public school district constructs them, we generally are able to get help under Public Law 815. But in this instance, we cannot do that, because this district happens to be a frugal district. They have always been on a pay-as-you-go basis, and in order to be eligible for assistance under Public Law 815, the district must be in distressed financial circumstances. Consequently, this district cannot qualify for aid under Public Law 815. In this case, 60 percent of the children who attend this public school are Indian children. So the Federal Government is paying a proportionate amount of the cost of that school in replacing the old school built in 1923 in order that the Government will not have to have a segregated school.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I was wondering whether there was any restriction in this policy of passing a special bill to create a liability upon the Federal Government to participate in the construction of a school, which also will be used by the general public in that area. Have we done this in the past?

Mr. BERRY. We never have because in all instances before, either the school district was in bad shape and could qualify under Public Law 815 or else they constructed their own building and then we paid tuition or contracted for the payment of the tuition.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder whether you are opening up an area here where you are going to have a number

of more or less private bills introduced for the purpose of having the Federal Government participate in the construction of a school for general purposes where they do not conform with a general building program, where we have agreed to go in and give aid for educational purposes in distressed areas, for instance.

Mr. BERRY. This is a special instance, because we hope to pass within the next 5 or 6 bills, a bill which provides termination for these Klamath Falls Indians.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is another thing I was going to say. There is another bill on the calendar, No. 530, where we terminate Federal supervision over these Indians. If we are going to terminate supervision over them so they are going to no longer be wards of the Government, then why do we at the same time enter into a contract to pay 60 percent of the cost of construction of the school in the area where these Indians will reside?

Mr. BERRY. It was thought it was a very good investment to pay this, because we are helping those people to build this school so that these Indian children can attend school. Sixty percent of the children enrolled are Indian children.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I have great confidence in the committee and in the gentleman, but it concerns me whether or not you are setting a policy that is going to be pretty hard to control, because wherever you have Indian reservations also generally in those areas the school districts have problems because of the fact that the tax base is generally not nearly as broad as in other areas, and they have difficulty in financing their schools, and they will be in here saying, "You did it for the Klamath Indians. Why don't you do it for us?"

Mr. BERRY. But here is 1 of 5 or 6 cases where we provide terminal legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Well, you do not make this dependent upon the fact that the Indians are going to be removed from supervision?

Mr. BERRY. Not entirely, but that is one of the controlling features.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield, we have had no other legislation before the committee like this, so that this does not set a policy. If these people are liberated, then it seems the Federal Government should give the local government some assistance so that these people can handle their problems and so that these children will have a place to go to school. It is not a policy that is being fixed by the committee.

Mr. BERRY. I might add that in these terminal legislation cases it is our thought that if we are going to do the kind of job that we want to do, we have to do everything we can to alleviate the impact on those local governments when we pass these terminal legislation bills.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not questioning that this is the desirable thing to do. If the gentleman says from his study that it is desirable, I will

accept his word. But I was just wondering how far we were going to go in this direction of taking care of cases on this basis.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$206,880 to be used by the Secretary of the Interior for assisting the Klamath County School District in constructing and equipping new public-school facilities, which shall include an elementary school site, school building, and necessary equipment, on the Klamath Indian Reservation at Chiloquin, Klamath County, Oreg.

Sec. 2. The expenditure of any money appropriated pursuant to the first section of this act shall be subject to the express conditions that (1) 40 percent of the cost of such facilities shall be paid by the Klamath County School District; (2) such facilities shall be available to all Indian children of the district on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition from Federal funds, as other children of the district; (3) the cost of preparing the plans and specifications for such facilities, to be furnished by the local or State authorities, shall be paid out of the appropriation authorized in this act in the same proportion as the building costs; (4) upon the approval of such plans and specifications by the Secretary of the Interior, the actual work shall proceed under the supervision of such local authority; and (5) payment for the work completed shall be made monthly on vouchers properly certified by the local officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR TAXATION BY STATE OF WYOMING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4770) to provide for taxation by the State of Wyoming of certain property located within the confines of Grand Teton National Park, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONSTRUCTION OF DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS ON AUTHORIZED FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS BY IRRIGATION DISTRICTS AND OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9981) to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

JOHN MARSHALL BICENTENNIAL MONTH

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 340) designating the month of September 1955 as John Marshall Bicentennial Month, and creating a commission to supervise and direct the observance of such month.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I notice in this particular proposal there is no limitation on the amount of money that will be made available, whereas in the several other bills that follow of the same category there is such a limitation. Could the gentleman from Ohio explain why there is such a limitation in two and not in this particular bill?

Mr. McCULLOCH. The limitation on the authorization inadvertently was not carried in House Joint Resolution 340. I say "inadvertently" because that is the fact. The sponsor of the resolution and the Judiciary Committee would like the RECORD to show at this time that it is the understanding, the unanimous understanding that there will be no more than \$10,000 used under this authorization, and it is hoped as a matter of fact that no money will be used whatsoever, because the various bar associations of the country are interested in this celebration and it is felt that they will contribute all the money necessary for the plans. I would like to say that if there is any request by anyone to the Appropriations Committee for more than \$10,000, I hope it will not be granted.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the explanation of the gentleman from Ohio I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 149, designating the month of September 1955 as John Marshall Bicentennial Month, and creating a commission to supervise and direct the observance of such month, for House Joint Resolution 340.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate resolution, as follows:

Whereas September 24, 1955, will mark the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Marshall, who has been rightly called "the Great Chief Justice"; and

Whereas the work of John Marshall in expounding constitutional principles has been one of the most important factors in developing and maintaining the liberties of the people of the United States; and

Whereas a wider public knowledge and appreciation of the achievements of the great Chief Justice, John Marshall, is highly desirable in order to strengthen the moral, social, and political structure of our Nation, and as a means of helping to preserve and protect the lives, liberties, and property of all our people: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the month of September 1955 is hereby set aside and designated as "John Marshall Bicentennial Month," in

commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Marshall, and in recognition of the vital part which he played in the development of our Nation. The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon appropriate agencies and organizations throughout the United States to unite in observing such bicentennial month with suitable activities and ceremonies, and inviting all the people of the United States to join therein.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Commission for the Celebration of the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and to be composed of 19 members as follows:

(1) The President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, ex officio;

(2) Eight persons to be appointed by the President of the United States;

(3) Four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and

(4) Four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall have the duty of supervising and directing the observance of John Marshall Bicentennial Month, and shall prepare appropriate plans and programs for the celebration of such month, giving due consideration to any proposed plans and programs which may be submitted to it. The Commission shall receive and coordinate any plans which may be prepared by State and local agencies, and by representative civic bodies, in connection with the celebration of such month. The Commission shall submit to the Congress at the earliest practicable time a full report of its activities together with a detailed statement of the plans and programs to be used in such celebration.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. Members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such, but shall be reimbursed for expenses necessarily incurred in the discharge of their duties under this joint resolution.

(b) The Commission may employ such administrative personnel, advisers, and clerical and other assistants as may be necessary to carry out its duties under this joint resolution.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall expire on December 31, 1955.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND ACT OF DECEMBER 3, 1942

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2389) to amend the act of December 3, 1942.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of December 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 1038; 33 U. S. C. 855a), is amended to read as follows:

"Commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey who, in time of war or national emergency declared by the President, are assigned to duty on projects for the military departments in areas determined by the Secretary of Defense to be of immediate military hazard, shall, while on such duty, be entitled to the rights and benefits provided by law for officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey who are actually transferred to the

service of the military departments: *Provided*, That the benefits of this section shall be applicable also to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey serving in the Philippine Islands on December 7, 1941."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMINATE SUPERVISION OVER KLAMATH TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2745) to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a few questions about this bill of some member of the committee.

I notice this bill provides for the creation of management specialists who are given control of the property of the tribe and of the disposition of that property. I want to know if that section has the approval and consent of the Klamath Indian Tribes and representatives of the tribe.

Mr. BERRY. I may say in answer to the gentleman's inquiry that each section of this bill has been gone over very carefully and approved by both groups of the tribe. The Indians of this reservation have been divided into two equal groups, for a number of years, now they have finally gotten together, worked out each section of this bill, and at the time of the hearings both came before the subcommittee and before the full committee and both groups were asked by the chairman if there was any objection to any of the provisions of this bill and if everything met with their full approval. Both groups were represented not only by their own representatives but also by their attorneys, before both the subcommittee and the full committee. So it does have the full approval of the Indians in every respect.

Mr. METCALF. In other words, this provision for management specialists which takes away from the tribe the power ordinarily given it to dispose of property and determine what property is to be sold, and so forth, is made with the full consent and approval of representatives of the tribe.

Mr. BERRY. That is right.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the trust and restricted property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians consisting of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and of the individual members thereof, for the disposition of federally owned property acquired or withdrawn for the administration of the affairs of said Indians, and for a termination of Federal services furnished such Indians because of their status as Indians.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act:

(a) "Tribe" means the Klamath Tribe of Indians consisting of the Klamath and Mo-

doc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians.

(b) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) "Lands" means real property, interests therein, or improvements thereon, and include water rights.

(d) "Tribal property" means any real or personal property, including water rights, or any interest in real or personal property, that belongs to the tribe and either is held by the United States in trust for the tribe or is subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States.

(e) "Adult" means a member of the tribe who has attained the age of 21 years.

SEC. 3. At midnight of the date of enactment of this act the roll of the tribe shall be closed and no child born thereafter shall be eligible for enrollment: *Provided*, That the tribe shall have a period of 6 months from the date of this act in which to prepare and submit to the Secretary a proposed roll of the members of the tribe living on the date of this act, which shall be published in the Federal Register. If the tribe fails to submit such roll within the time specified in this section, the Secretary shall prepare a proposed roll for the tribe, which shall be published in the Federal Register. Any person claiming membership rights in the tribe or an interest in its assets, or a representative of the Secretary on behalf of any such person, may, within 90 days from the date of publication of the proposed roll, file an appeal with the Secretary contesting the inclusion or omission of the name of any person on or from such roll. The Secretary shall review such appeals and his decisions thereon shall be final and conclusive. After disposition of all such appeals, the roll of the tribe shall be published in the Federal Register, and such roll shall be final for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. Upon publication in the Federal Register of the final roll as provided in section 3 of this act, the rights or beneficial interests in tribal property of each person whose name appears on the roll shall constitute personal property which may be inherited or bequeathed, but shall not otherwise be subject to alienation or encumbrance before the transfer of title to such tribal property as provided in section 7 of this act without the approval of the Secretary. Any contract made in violation of this section shall be null and void.

SEC. 5. (a) The tribe is authorized to select and retain the services of qualified management specialists, including tax consultants, for the purpose of studying reservation resources on the Klamath Reservation and making such reports or recommendations, including appraisals of Klamath tribal property, as may be desired by the tribe, and to make other studies and reports as may be deemed necessary and desirable by the tribe in connection with the termination of Federal supervision as provided for hereafter. Such reports should include, but not limited to, the feasibility of a continuation of the practice of sustained yield management of the Klamath Indian Forest, and shall be completed not later than 2 years from the date of enactment of this act. Such specialists are to be retained under contracts entered into between them and authorized representatives of the tribe, subject to approval of the Secretary. Such amounts of Klamath tribal funds as may be required for this purpose shall be made available by the Secretary.

(b) The tribe shall have a period not to exceed 3 years from the date of this act to prepare and submit to the Secretary a plan for future control of the tribal property when title is transferred as provided in section 7 of this act. The Secretary is authorized to provide such assistance as may be available and as may be requested by officials of the tribe in the formulation of such plan or plans, including necessary consultations

with representatives of Federal departments and agencies, officials of the State of Oregon and political subdivisions thereof, and members of the tribe.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized and directed, as soon as practicable after the passage of this act, to pay from such funds as are deposited to the credit of the tribe in the Treasury of the United States \$250 to each member of the tribe on the rolls of the tribe on the date of this act. Any other person whose application for enrollment on the rolls of the tribe is subsequently approved, pursuant to the terms of section 3 hereof, shall, after enrollment, be paid a like sum of \$250: *Provided*, That such payments shall be made first from the capital reserve fund created by the act of August 28, 1937 (25 U. S. C., sec. 530).

SEC. 7. (a) Upon request of the tribe, approved by a majority of the adult members thereof voting in a referendum called by the Secretary, the Secretary is authorized to transfer within 4 years from the date of this act to a corporation or other legal entity organized by the tribe in a form satisfactory to the Secretary title to all or any part of the tribal property, real and personal, or to transfer to one or more trustees designated by the tribe and approved by the Secretary title to all or any part of such property to be held in trust for management or liquidation purposes under such terms and conditions as may be specified by the tribe and approved by the Secretary.

(b) Title to any tribal property that is not transferred in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be transferred by the Secretary to one or more trustees designated by him for the liquidation and distribution of assets among the members of the tribe under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That the trust agreement shall provide for the termination of the trust not more than 3 years from the date of such transfer unless the term of the trust is extended by order of a judge of a court of record designated in the trust agreement: *Provided further*, That the trust agreement shall provide that at any time before the sale of tribal property by the trustees the tribe may notify the trustees that it elects to retain such property and to transfer title thereto to a corporation, other legal entity, or trustee in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and that the trustees shall transfer title to such property in accordance with the notice from the tribe if it is approved by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall not approve any form of organization pursuant to subsection (a) of this section that provides for the transfer of stock or an undivided share in corporate assets as compensation for the services of agents or attorneys unless such transfer is based upon an appraisal of tribal assets that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) When approving or disapproving the selection of trustees in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and when designating trustees pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall give due regard to the laws of the State of Oregon that relate to the selection of trustees, and shall require such trustees to provide a performance bond.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary is directed to reserve subsurface rights in tribal property, from any sale or division of such property, and to require any corporation trustee or trustees to whom title to tribal property is transferred to retain title to the subsurface rights in such property for not less than 10 years.

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to transfer within 4 years from the date of this act to each member of the tribe unrestricted control of funds or other personal property held in trust for such member by the United States.

(b) All restrictions on the sale or encumbrance of trust or restricted land owned by members of the tribe (including allottees, heirs, and devisees, either adult or minor) are hereby removed 4 years after the date of this act, and the patents or deeds under which titles are then held shall pass the titles in fee simple, subject to any valid encumbrances: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to subsurface rights in such lands, and the Secretary is directed to transfer such subsurface rights to one or more trustees designated by him for management for a period not less than 10 years. The titles to all interests in trust or restricted land acquired by members of the tribe by devise or inheritance 4 years or more after the date of act shall vest in such members in fee simple, subject to any valid encumbrance.

(c) Prior to the time provided in subsection (b) of this section for the removal of restrictions on land owned by more than one member of a tribe, the Secretary may—

(1) upon request of any of the owners, petition the land and issue to each owner a patent or deed for his individual share that shall become unrestricted 4 years from the date of this act;

(2) upon request of any of the owners, and a finding by the Secretary that partition of all or any part of the land is not practicable, cause all or any part of the land to be sold at not less than the appraised value thereof and distribute the proceeds of sale to the owners: *Provided*, That any one or more of the owners may elect before a sale to purchase the other interests in the land at not less than the appraised value thereof, and the purchaser shall receive an unrestricted patent or deed to the land; and

(3) if the whereabouts of none of the owners can be ascertained, cause such lands to be sold and deposit the proceeds of sale in the Treasury of the United States for safekeeping.

(d) The Secretary is hereby authorized to approve—

(1) the exchange of trust or restricted land between the tribe and any of its members;

(2) the sale by the tribe of tribal property to individual members of the tribe; and

(3) the exchange of tribal property for real property in fee status. Title to all real property included in any sale or exchange as provided in this subsection shall be conveyed in fee simple.

SEC. 9. (a) The act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 855), the act of February 14, 1913 (37 Stat. 678), and other acts amendatory thereto shall not apply to the probate of the trust and restricted property of the members of the tribe who die 6 months or more after the date of this act.

(b) The laws of the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia with respect to the probate of wills, the determination of heirs, and the administration of decedents' estates shall apply to the individual property of members of the tribe who die 6 months or more after the date of this act.

(c) Section 5 of the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 605), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 10. The Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to transfer to the tribe or any member or group of members thereof any federally owned property acquired, withdrawn, or used for the administration of the affairs of the tribe which he deems necessary for Indian use, or to transfer to a public or nonprofit body any such property which he deems necessary for public use and from which members of the tribe will derive benefit.

SEC. 11. No property distributed under the provisions of this act shall at the time of distribution be subject to Federal or State income tax. Following any distribution of property made under the provisions of this act, such property and any income derived

therefrom by the individual, corporation, or other legal entity shall be subject to the same taxes, State and Federal, as in the case of non-Indians: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of capital gains or losses the base value of the property shall be the value of the property when distributed to the individual, corporation, or other legal entity.

SEC. 12. Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 872, 873), and section 2 (a) of the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1253), are repealed effective on the date of this act. All loans made from the reimbursable loan fund established by section 2 of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 872), and all other loans made from Klamath tribal funds, including loans of livestock made by the tribes repayable in kind, are hereby transferred to the tribe for collection in accordance with the terms thereof.

SEC. 13. (a) That part of section 5 of the act of August 13, 1914 (35 Stat. 687; 43 U. S. C. 499), which relates to the transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance of reclamation works to water users associations or irrigation districts shall be applicable to the irrigation works on the Klamath Reservation.

(b) Effective on the first day of the calendar year beginning after the date of the proclamation provided for in section 18 of this act, the deferment of the assessment and collection of construction costs provided for in the first proviso of the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564; 25 U. S. C. 388a), shall terminate with respect to any lands within irrigation projects on the Klamath Reservation. The Secretary shall cause the first lien against such lands created by the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210), to be filed of record in the appropriate county office.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$89,212 for payment to the Klamath Tribe with interest at 4 percent annually as reimbursement for tribal funds used for irrigation construction operation and maintenance benefiting nontribal lands on the Klamath Reservation, such interest being computed from the dates of disbursement of such funds from the United States Treasury.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to adjust, eliminate, or cancel all or any part of reimbursable irrigation operation and maintenance costs and reimbursable irrigation construction costs chargeable against Indian owned lands that are subject to the provisions of this act, and all or any part of assessments heretofore or hereafter imposed on account of such costs, when he determines that the collection thereof would be inequitable or would result in undue hardship on the Indian owner of the land, or that the administrative costs of collection would probably equal or exceed the amount collected.

(e) Nothing contained in any other section of this act shall affect in any way the laws applicable to irrigation projects on the Klamath Reservation.

SEC. 14. (a) Nothing in this act shall abrogate any water rights of the tribe and its members, and the laws of the State of Oregon with respect to the abandonment of water rights by nonuse shall not apply to the tribe and its members until 10 years after the date of the proclamation issued pursuant to section 18 of this act.

(b) Nothing in this act shall abrogate any fishing rights or privileges of the tribe or the members thereof enjoyed under Federal treaty.

SEC. 15. Prior to the transfer of title to, or the removal of restrictions from, property in accordance with the provisions of this act, the Secretary shall protect the rights of members of the tribe who are minors, non compos mentis, or in the opinion of the Secretary in need of assistance in con-

ducting their affairs, by causing the appointment of guardians for such members in courts of competent jurisdiction, or by such other means as he may deem adequate.

SEC. 16. Pending the completion of the property dispositions provided for in this act, the funds now on deposit, or hereafter deposited, in the United States Treasury to the credit of the tribe shall be available for advance to the tribe, or for expenditure, for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the tribe and approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 17. The Secretary shall have authority to execute such patents, deeds, assignments, releases, certificates, contracts, and other instruments as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act, or to establish a marketable and recordable title to any property disposed of pursuant to this act.

SEC. 18. (a) Upon removal of Federal restrictions on the property of the tribe and individual members thereof, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a proclamation declaring that the Federal trust relationship to the affairs of the tribe and its members has terminated. Thereafter individual members of the tribe shall not be entitled to any of the services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians and, except as otherwise provided in this act, all statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall no longer be applicable to the members of the tribe, and the laws of the several States shall apply to the tribe and its members in the same manner as they apply to other citizens or persons within their jurisdiction.

(b) Nothing in this act shall affect the status of the members of the tribe as citizens of the United States.

SEC. 19. Effective on the date of the proclamation provided for in section 18 of the act, all powers of the Secretary or other officer of the United States to take, review, or approve any action under the constitution and bylaws of the tribe are hereby terminated. Any powers conferred upon the tribe by such constitution which are inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby terminated. Such termination shall not affect the power of the tribe to take any action under its constitution and bylaws that is consistent with this act without the participation of the Secretary or other officer of the United States.

SEC. 20. The Secretary is authorized to set off against any indebtedness payable to the tribe or to the United States by an individual member of the tribe or payable to the United States by the tribe, any funds payable to such individual or tribe, under this act and to deposit the amounts set off to the credit of the tribe or the United States as the case may be.

SEC. 21. Nothing in this act shall affect any claim heretofore filed against the United States by the tribe.

SEC. 22. Nothing in this act shall abrogate any valid lease, permit, license, right-of-way, lien, or other contract heretofore approved. Whenever any such instrument places in or reserves to the Secretary any powers, duties, or other functions with respect to the property subject thereto, the Secretary may transfer such functions, in whole or in part, to any Federal agency with the consent of such agency and may transfer such functions, in whole or in part to a State agency with the consent of such agency and the other party or parties to such instrument.

SEC. 23. The Secretary is authorized to issue rules or regulations necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, and may in his discretion provide for tribal referenda on matters pertaining to management or disposition of tribal assets.

SEC. 24. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed insofar as they affect the tribe or its members.

Effective on the first day of the fiscal year beginning after the date of the proclamation provided for in section 18 of this act, section 2 of the act of August 19, 1949 (63 Stat. 621, ch. 468) shall become inapplicable to the unrecouped balance of funds expended in cooperation with the school board of Klamath County, Oreg., pursuant to said act.

SEC. 25. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 26. Prior to the issuance of a proclamation in accordance with the provisions of section 18 of this act, the Secretary is authorized to undertake, within the limits of available appropriations, a special program of education and training designed to help the members of the tribe to earn a livelihood, to conduct their own affairs, and to assume their responsibilities as citizens without special services because of their status as Indians. Such program may include language training, orientation in non-Indian community customs and living standards, vocational training and related subjects, transportation to the place of training or instruction, and subsistence during the course of training or instruction. For the purposes of such program the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with any Federal, State, or local governmental agency, corporation, association, or person. Nothing in this section shall preclude any Federal agency from undertaking any other program for the education and training of Indians with funds appropriated to it.

With the following committee amendments:

Amendment 1: on page 3, beginning on line 23, strike all of section 5 and insert the following new language:

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to select and retain by contract, at the earliest practicable time after the enactment of this act and after consultation with the tribe at a general meeting called for that purpose, the services of qualified management specialists who shall—

"(1) cause an appraisal to be made, within not more than 12 months after their employment, or as soon thereafter as practicable, of all tribal property showing its fair market value by practicable logging or other appropriate economic units;

"(2) give each adult member of the tribe, immediately after the appraisal of the tribal property, an opportunity to elect for himself, and, in the case of a head of a family, for the members of the family who are minors, to withdraw from the tribe and have his interest in tribal property converted into money and paid to him, or to remain in the tribe and participate in the tribal management plan to be prepared pursuant to paragraph (5) of this subsection;

"(3) determine and select the portion of the tribal property which if sold at the appraised value would provide sufficient funds to pay the members who elect to have their interests converted into money, arrange for the sale of such property, and distribute the proceeds of sale among the members entitled thereto: *Provided*, That whenever funds have accumulated in the amount of \$200,000 or more, such funds shall be distributed pro rata to the members who elected to take distribution of their individual shares, and thereafter similar pro rata distribution shall be made whenever funds have accumulated in the amount of \$200,000 or more until all of the property set aside for sale shall have been sold and the proceeds distributed: *Provided further*, That any such member shall have the right to purchase any part of such property for not less than the highest offer

received by competitive bid, and to apply toward the purchase price all or any part of the sum due him from the conversion of his interest in tribal property: *Provided further*, That when determining and selecting the portion of the tribal property to be sold, due consideration shall be given to the use of such property for grazing purposes by the members of both groups of the tribe;

"(4) cause such studies and reports to be made as may be deemed necessary or desirable by the tribe or by the Secretary in connection with the termination of Federal supervision as provided for in this act; and

"(5) cause a plan to be prepared in form and content satisfactory to the tribe and to the Secretary for the management of tribal property through a trustee, corporation, or other legal entity.

"(b) Such amounts of Klamath tribal funds as may be required for the purposes of this section shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the expenses incident to the sale of property and the distribution of proceeds of sale pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection shall be charged exclusively to the interests of the members who withdraw from the tribe, and the expenses incurred under paragraphs (4) and (5) of this subsection shall be charged exclusively to the interests of the members who remain in the tribe, and all other expenses under this section shall be charged to the interests of both groups of members."

Amendment 2: On page 5, preceding line 1, insert the following new language:

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to execute any conveyancing instrument that is necessary or appropriate to convey title to tribal property to be sold in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 5 of this act, and to transfer title to all other tribal property to a trustee, corporation, or other legal entity in accordance with the plan prepared pursuant to paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of section 5 of this act.

"(b) It is the intention of the Congress that all of the actions required by sections 5 and 6 of this act shall be completed at the earliest practicable time and in no event later than 4 years from the date of this act.

"(c) Members of the tribe who receive the money value of their interests in tribal property shall thereupon cease to be members of the tribe: *Provided*, That nothing shall prevent them from sharing in the proceeds of tribal claims against the United States."

Amendment 3: On page 5, line 1, strike the words "SEC. 6." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 7."

Amendment 4: Strike all of section 7 beginning on page 5, line 12, and strike everything through page 7, line 11.

Amendment 5: On page 8, line 4, at the end of the line, following the word "of" add the word "this."

Amendment 6: On page 10, beginning on line 20, strike all of section 12 and add the following new language:

"SEC. 12. Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 872, 873), and section 2 (a) of the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1253), are repealed effective on the date of the transfer of title to tribal property to a trustee, corporation, or other legal entity pursuant to section 6 of this act. All loans made from the reimbursable loan fund established by section 2 of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 872), and all other loans made from Klamath tribal funds, including loans of livestock made by the tribe repayable in kind, shall be transferred to the tribe for collection in accordance with the terms thereof."

Amendment 7: On page 12, line 21, strike the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen."

Amendment 8: On page 15, line 3, strike the comma between the words "tribe" and "under."

Amendment 9: On page 15, line 6, strike all of section 21 and insert the following new language:

"Sec. 21. Nothing contained in this act shall deprive the tribe or its constituent parts of any right, privilege, or benefit granted by the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR AN INSPECTION STATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3239) to authorize conveyance of land to the State of California for an inspection station.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell at not less than the appraised value thereof to the State of California, and to convey by appropriate instrument, the following-described land:

Beginning at a three-fourths inch iron pipe on the westerly right-of-way line of California State Highway No. 395, said point of beginning more particularly described as being north forty-six degrees forty-six minutes fifty-three seconds east, four thousand two hundred ten and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet from the corner common to sections 32 and 33, township 43 north, range 13 east, and sections 4 and 5, township 42 north, range 13 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian, and north fifty-five degrees forty-two minutes west, fifty feet from station 214 on the center line of California State Highway No. 395, as shown on the accompanying map of the above-mentioned highway; thence, from said point of beginning north fifty-five degrees forty-two minutes west, one hundred thirty and fifteen one-hundredths feet to a three-fourths inch iron pipe on the easterly right-of-way line of the Southern Pacific Railroad; thence, north forty degrees four minutes east, along said right-of-way line seven hundred three and fifty-six one-hundredths feet to a three-fourths inch iron pipe; thence, south fifty-five degrees forty-two minutes east, fifty-nine and forty-eight one-hundredths feet to a three-fourths inch iron pipe in the westerly right-of-way line of California State Highway No. 395; thence south thirty-four degrees eighteen minutes west, seven hundred feet to the point of beginning.

Sec. 2. The proceeds of the sale of the land shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Pitt River Indians under the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out the comma and the following: "as shown on the accompanying map of the above-mentioned highway."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER THE PROPERTY OF THE ALABAMA AND COUSHATTA TRIBES OF INDIANS (TEXAS)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2744) to provide for the termination of Federal

supervision over the property of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Indians of Texas, and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, reserving that right to object, I wish to ask the committee if in this case there have been consultations and consent of the Indian tribes involved?

Mr. BERRY. There has been consultation and consent, and the State Legislature of the State of Texas passed a law to permit the passage of this sort of legislation so that the State, the Indians, and the local county organizations have all agreed.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman. I want to compliment the committee for providing what I believe is the proper kind of legislation in treating with this property and the bill having some recognition of the needs of the Indians.

Mr. BERRY. The gentleman will find on pages 8 and 9 of the report the resolution by the various organizations to carry out the effect of this bill.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this bill might be placed at the end of the calendar? There are a few words I am interested in trying to work out. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OF THE PROPERTY OF CERTAIN TRIBES AND BANDS OF INDIANS LOCATED IN WESTERN OREGON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2746) to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes and bands of Indians located in western Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the same question if there has been consent and consultation with these tribes before this bill was reported out of the committee?

Mr. BERRY. Consent, consultation and request by the Indians has been given and made for this specific legislation. These Indian people have been very anxious for several years that this sort of legislation be passed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my curiosity has been aroused from the questions that have been asked. There is a bill coming up under suspension later. I wonder if consultation and consent have been provided in that bill?

Mr. METCALF. For the information of the gentleman, the bill that is coming up later is a bill providing for extension work among Indians and transfer of that extension work from the Department of

Interior to the Department of Agriculture. There has not been consent and consultation with a good many tribes of Indians in reference to that transfer. Many Indians, including Indians in the State of Montana, have objected to such a transfer. The point I am trying to make in this colloquy with the gentleman from South Dakota is that these bills that are being considered are passed because they have the consent and consultation has been worked out with the representatives of the Indian tribes.

Mr. BERRY. That is correct. The only reason these bills are on the Consent Calendar is because they do have the complete consent and cooperation of the Indian tribes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why would that not be true in connection with the other bill that is coming up later, the bill that will come up under suspension of the rules later today?

Mr. METCALF. The other day in reference to the Utah termination bill I told the committee I would be constrained to object to any bill that did not have the consent of the Indian tribes involved and did not have full protection of their interests.

Mr. McCORMACK. If there is an amendment put in the bill that will come up under suspension that is protective, as you say, of the Indians' rights or the rights of the Indians, the gentleman would have no objection to the bill?

Mr. METCALF. If I could offer an amendment to that effect I would be completely satisfied.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why does not the gentleman confer with the gentlemen on the other side? They might agree to an amendment, and then the move to suspend the rules and pass the bill could be done with the amendment. It all comes up under suspension. I suggest that the gentleman confer with those interested and you may agree on an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the trust and restricted property of certain tribes and bands of Indians located in western Oregon and the individual members thereof, for the disposition of federally owned property acquired or withdrawn for the administration of the affairs of such Indians, and for a termination of Federal services furnished such Indians because of their status as Indians.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this act:

(a) "Tribe" means any of the tribes, bands, groups, or communities of Indians located west of the Cascade Mountains in Oregon, including the following: Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, Alsea, Applegate Creek, Calapooya, Chaftan, Chempho, Chetco, Chetlesington, Chinook, Clackamas, Clatskanie, Clatsop, Clowewalla, Coos, Cow Creek, Eucches, Galic, Creek, Grave, Joshua, Karok, Kathlamet, Kusotony, Kwatami or Sixes, Lakmiut, Long Tom Creek, Lower Coquille, Lower Umpqua, Maddy, Mackanotin, Mary's River, Multnomah, Munsel Creek, Naltunnetunne, Nehalem, Nestucca, Northern Molalla, Port Orford, Pudding River, Rogue River, Salmon River, Santiam, Scoton, Shasta, Shasta Costa, Siletz, Siuslaw, Skiloot, Southern Molalla, Takeima,

Tillamook, Tolowa, Tualatin, Tutuni, Upper Coquille, Upper Umpqua, Willamette Tumwater, Yamhill, Yaquina, and Yoncalla;

(b) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) "Lands" means real property, interest therein, or improvements thereon, and includes water rights.

(d) "Tribal property" means any real or personal property, including water rights, or any interest in real or personal property, that belongs to the tribe and either is held by the United States in trust for the tribe or is subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States.

SEC. 3. Within 90 days after the date of this act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register (1) a list of those tribes for which membership rolls will be required for the purposes of this act, and (2) a list of those tribes for which no membership rolls will be required for the purposes of this act. Each tribe on each list shall have a period of 6 months from the date of publication of the notice in which to prepare and submit to the Secretary a proposed roll of the members of the tribe living on the date of this act, which shall be published in the Federal Register. In the absence of applicable law, or eligibility requirements in an approved constitution, bylaws, or membership ordinance, eligibility for enrollment shall be determined under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. No person shall be enrolled on more than one tribal roll prepared pursuant to this act. If a tribe on list one fails to submit such roll within the time specified in this section, the Secretary shall prepare a proposed roll for the tribe, which shall be published in the Federal Register. Any person claiming membership rights in the tribe or an interest in its assets, or a representative of the Secretary on behalf of any such person, may, within 90 days from the date of publication of the proposed roll, file an appeal with the Secretary contesting the inclusion or omission of the name of any person on or from such roll. The Secretary shall review such appeals and his decisions thereon shall be final and conclusive. After disposition of all such appeals the roll of the tribe shall be published in the Federal Register and such roll shall be final for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. Upon publication in the Federal Register of the final roll as provided in section 3 of this act, the rights or beneficial interests in tribal property of each person whose name appears on the roll shall constitute personal property which may be inherited or bequeathed, but shall not otherwise be subject to alienation or encumbrance before the transfer of title to such tribal property as provided in section 5 of this act without the approval of the Secretary. Any contract made in violation of this section shall be null and void.

SEC. 5. (a) Upon request of a tribe, the Secretary is authorized within 2 years from the date of this act to transfer to a corporation or other legal entity organized by the tribe in a form satisfactory to the Secretary title to all or any part of the tribal property, real and personal, or to transfer to one or more trustees designated by the tribe and approved by the Secretary, title to all or any part of such property to be held in trust for management or liquidation purposes under such terms and conditions as may be specified by the tribe and approved by the Secretary, or to sell all or any part of such property and make a pro rata distribution of the proceeds of sale among the members of the tribe after deducting, in his discretion, reasonable costs of sale and distribution.

(b) Title to any tribal property that is not transferred in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be transferred by the Secretary to one or more trustees designated by him for the liquidation and distribution of assets among

the members of the tribe under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That the trust agreement shall provide for the termination of the trust not more than 3 years from the date of such transfer unless the term of the trust is extended by order of a judge of a court of record designated in the trust agreement; *Provided further*, That the trust agreement shall provide that at any time before the sale of tribal property by the trustees the tribe may notify the trustees that it elects to retain such property and to transfer title thereto to a corporation, other legal entity, or trustee in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and that the trustees shall transfer title to such property in accordance with the notice from the tribe if it is approved by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall not approve any form of organization pursuant to subsection (a) of this section that provides for the transfer of stock or an undivided share in corporate assets as compensation for the services of agents or attorneys unless such transfer is based upon an appraisal of tribal assets that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) When approving or disapproving the selection of trustees in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and when designating trustees pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall give due regard to the laws of the State of Oregon that relate to the selection of trustees.

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to transfer within 2 years after the date of this act to each member of each tribe unrestricted control of funds or other personal property held in trust for such member by the United States.

(b) All restrictions on the sale or encumbrance of trust or restricted land owned by members of the tribes (including allottees, purchasers, heirs, and devisees, either adult or minor) are hereby removed 2 years after the date of this act and the patents or deeds under which titles are then held shall pass the titles in fee simple, subject to any valid encumbrance. The titles to all interests in trust or restricted land acquired by members of the tribes by devise or inheritance 2 years or more after the date of this act shall vest in such members in fee simple, subject to any valid encumbrance.

(c) Prior to the time provided in subsection (d) of this section for the removal of restrictions on land owned by more than one member of a tribe, the Secretary may—

- (1) upon request of any of the owners, partition the land and issue to each owner a patent or deed for his individual share that shall become unrestricted 2 years from the date of this act;

- (2) upon request of any of the owners and a finding by the Secretary that partition of all or any part of the land is not practicable, cause all or any part of the land to be sold at not less than the appraised value thereof and distribute the proceeds of sale to the owners: *Provided*, That any one or more of the owners may elect before a sale to purchase the other interests in the land at not less than the appraised value thereof, and the purchaser shall receive an unrestricted patent or deed to the land; and

- (3) if the whereabouts of none of the owners can be ascertained, cause such lands to be sold and deposit the proceeds of sale in the Treasury of the United States for safekeeping.

SEC. 7. (a) The act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 855), the act of February 14, 1913 (37 Stat. 678), and other acts amendatory thereto shall not apply to the probate of the trust and restricted property of the members of the tribes who die 6 months or more after the date of this act.

(b) The laws of the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia with respect to the probate of wills,

the determination of heirs, and the administration of decedents' estates shall apply to the individual property of members of the tribes who die 6 months or more after the date of this act.

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to transfer to any tribe or any member or group of members thereof any federally owned property acquired, withdrawn, or used for the administration of the affairs of the tribes subject to this act which he deems necessary for Indian use, or to transfer to a public or nonprofit body any such property which he deems necessary for public use and from which members of the tribes will derive benefits.

SEC. 9. No property distributed under the provisions of this act shall at the time of distribution be subject to Federal or State income tax. Following any distribution of property made under the provisions of this act, such property and any income derived therefrom by the individual, corporation, or other legal entity shall be subject to the same taxes, State and Federal, as in the case of non-Indians: *Provided*, That for the purpose of capital gains or losses the base value of the property shall be the value of the property when distributed to the individual, corporation, or other legal entity.

SEC. 10. Prior to the transfer of title to, or the removal of restrictions from, property in accordance with the provisions of this act, the Secretary shall protect the rights of members of the tribes who are minors, non compos mentis, or in the opinion of the Secretary in need of assistance in conducting their affairs by causing the appointment of guardians for such members in courts of competent jurisdiction, or by such other means as he may deem adequate.

SEC. 11. Pending the completion of the property dispositions provided for in this act, the funds now on deposit, or hereafter deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of a tribe shall be available for advance to the tribe, or for expenditure, for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the tribe and approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 12. The Secretary shall have authority to execute such patents, deeds, assignments, releases, certificates, contracts, and other instruments as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act, or to establish a marketable and recordable title to any property disposed of pursuant to this act.

SEC. 13. (a) Upon removal of Federal restrictions on the property of each tribe and individual members thereof, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a proclamation declaring that the Federal trust relationship to the affairs of the tribe and its members has terminated. Thereafter individual members of the tribe shall not be entitled to any of the services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians, all statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians, excluding statutes that specifically refer to the tribe and its members, shall no longer be applicable to the members of the tribe, and the laws of the several States shall apply to the tribe and its members in the same manner as they apply to other citizens or persons within their jurisdiction.

(b) Nothing in this act shall affect the status of the members of a tribe as citizens of the United States, or shall affect their rights, privileges, immunities, and obligations as such citizens.

(c) Prior to the issuance of a proclamation in accordance with the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to undertake, within the limits of available appropriations, a special program of education and training designed to help the members of the tribe to earn a livelihood, to conduct their own affairs, and to assume their responsibilities as citizens without special

services because of their status as Indians. Such program may include language training, orientation in non-Indian community customs and living standards, vocational training and related subjects, transportation to the place of training or instruction, and subsistence during the course of training or instruction. For the purposes of such program the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with any Federal, State, or local governmental agency, corporation, association, or person. Nothing in this section shall preclude any Federal agency from undertaking any other program for the education and training of Indians with funds appropriated to it.

Sec. 14. (a) Effective on the date of the proclamation provided for in section 13 of this act, the corporate charter of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community, Oreg., issued pursuant to the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended, and ratified by the Community on August 22, 1936, is hereby revoked.

(b) Effective on the date of the proclamation provided for in section 13 of this act, all powers of the Secretary or other officer of the United States to take, review, or approve any action under the constitution and bylaws of the tribe are hereby terminated. Any powers conferred upon the tribe by such constitution which are inconsistent with the provisions of the act are hereby terminated. Such termination shall not affect the power of the tribe to take any action under its constitution and bylaws that is consistent with this act without the participation of the Secretary or other officer of the United States.

Sec. 15. The Secretary is authorized to set off against any indebtedness payable to the tribe or to the United States by an individual member of the tribe, or payable to the United States by the tribe any funds payable to such individual or tribe under this act and to deposit the amount set off to the credit of the tribe or to the United States as the case may be.

Sec. 16. Nothing in this act shall affect any claim heretofore filed against the United States by any tribe.

Sec. 17. Nothing in this act shall abrogate any valid lease, permit, license, right-of-way, lien, or other contract heretofore approved. Whenever any such instrument places in or reserves to the Secretary any powers, duties, or other functions with respect to the property subject thereto, the Secretary may transfer such functions, in whole or in part, to any Federal agency with the consent of such agency.

Sec. 18. The Secretary is authorized to issue rules and regulations necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, and may in his discretion provide for tribal referenda on matters pertaining to management or disposition of tribal assets.

Sec. 19. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed insofar as they affect a tribe or its members. The act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 948), as amended by the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 378), shall not apply to a tribe and its members after the date of the proclamation provided for in section 13 of this act.

Sec. 20. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 10, strike out all of subsection 13 (b), lines 15 to 18 inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the words:

"(b) Nothing in this act shall affect the status of the members of a tribe as citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTE INDIAN TRIBE OF THE UINTAH AND OURAY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3532) to provide for the partition and distribution of the assets of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah between the mixed-blood and full-blood members thereof; and for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the mixed-blood members of said tribe; to provide a development program for the full-blood members of said tribe; and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is to provide for the partition and distribution of the assets of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Utah and Ouray Reservation in Utah between the mixed-blood and full-blood members thereof; for the termination of Federal supervision over the trust, and restricted property, of the mixed-blood members of said tribe; and for a development program for the full-blood members thereof, to assist them in preparing for termination of Federal supervision over their property.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(a) "Tribe" means the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Utah.

(b) "Full-blood" means a member of the tribe who possesses more than one-half degree of Ute Indian blood, excepting those who become mixed-bloods by choice under the provisions of section 4 hereof.

(c) "Mixed-blood" means a member of the tribe who possesses one-half degree or less of Ute Indian blood, and those who become mixed-bloods by choice under the provisions of section 4 hereof.

(d) "Secretary" means Secretary of the Interior.

(e) "Superintendent" means the Superintendent of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Utah.

(f) "Asset" means any property of the tribe, real, personal or mixed, whether held by the tribe or by the United States in trust for the tribe, or subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States.

(g) "Adult" means a member of the tribe who has attained the age of 21 years.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this act Ute Indian blood shall be determined in accordance with the constitution and bylaws of the tribe and all tribal ordinances in force and effect on the effective date of this act.

Sec. 4. Any member of the tribe whose name appears on the proposed roll of full-blood members as provided in section 8 hereof and any person whose name is added to such proposed roll as the result of an appeal to the Secretary may apply to the Superintendent to become identified with and a part of the mixed-blood group: *Provided*, That such application is made within 30 days subsequent to the publication of such proposed roll or in the event of an appeal within 30 days subsequent to notification of the decision on said appeal: *And provided further*, That before such transfer is made upon the official rolls the Secretary shall first certify that, in his opinion, such change in status is not detrimental to the best interest of the person seeking such change.

Sec. 5. Effective on the date of publication of the final rolls as provided in section 8

hereof the tribe shall thereafter consist exclusively of full-blood members. Mixed-blood members shall have no interest therein except as otherwise provided in this act.

Sec. 6. The mixed-blood members of the tribe, including those residing on and off the reservation, shall have the right to organize for their common welfare, and may adopt an appropriate constitution and bylaws which shall become effective when ratified by a majority vote of the adult mixed-blood members of the tribe at a special election authorized and called by the Secretary under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. Such constitution may provide for the selection of authorized representatives who shall have power to take any action that is required by this act to be taken by the mixed-blood members as a group: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as requiring said mixed-blood Indians to so organize if such organization is by them deemed unnecessary. In the event no such approved organization is effected, any action taken by the adult mixed-blood members, by majority vote, whether in public meeting or by referendum, but in either event, after such notice as may be prescribed by the Secretary, shall be binding upon said mixed-blood members of the tribe for the purposes of this act.

Sec. 7. The mixed-blood members of the tribe as a group may employ legal counsel to accomplish the legal work required on behalf of said group under the terms of this act, and for any other purpose by them deemed necessary or desirable; the choice of counsel and fixing of fees to be subject to the approval of the Secretary until Federal supervision over all of the members of said group and their property is terminated in the manner provided in section 16 of this act.

Sec. 8. The tribe shall have a period of 30 days from the date of enactment of this act in which to prepare and submit to the Secretary a proposed roll of the full-blood members of the tribe, and a proposed roll of the mixed-blood members of the tribe, living on the date of enactment of this act. If the tribe fails to submit such proposed rolls within the time specified in this act, the Secretary shall prepare such proposed rolls for the tribe. Said proposed rolls shall be published in the Federal Register, and in a newspaper of general circulation in each of the counties of Uintah and Duchesne in the State of Utah. Any person claiming membership rights in the tribe, or an interest in its assets, or a representative of the Secretary on behalf of any such person, within 60 days from the date of publication in the Federal Register, or in either of the papers of general circulation, as hereinbefore provided, whichever publication date is last, may file an appeal with the Secretary contesting the inclusion or omission of the name of any person on or from either of such proposed rolls. The Secretary shall review such appeals and his decisions thereon shall be final and conclusive. After disposition of all such appeals to the Secretary, and after all transfers have been made pursuant to section 4 hereof the roll of the full-blood members of the tribe, and the roll of the mixed-blood members of the tribe, shall be published in the Federal Register, and such rolls shall be final for the purposes of this act.

Sec. 9. The business committee of the tribe for and on behalf of the full-blood members of said tribe, and the duly authorized representatives for the mixed-blood members of said tribe, acting jointly, are hereby authorized, subject to the approval of the Secretary, to sell, exchange, dispose of, and convey to any purchaser deemed satisfactory to said committee and representatives, any or all of the lands of said tribe described as follows, to wit:

Description	Section	Acres	Description	Section	Acres
Township 1 North, Range 1 East: NW/4 SW/4.....	35	40.00	Township 3 South Range 1 East: Lot 2; SE/4 NW/4; S/2 NE/4.....	7	158.12
Township 1 North, Range 1 West: W/2 NE/4.....	20	80.00	N/2 SW/4; SW/4 NE/4; NW/4 SE/4.....	16	160.00
SE/4 SW/4.....	21	40.00	Lots 1, 2 & 3; NE/4 SW/4.....	18	155.35
NE/4 NW/4; N/2 SW/4.....	28	120.00	E/2 NE/4.....	30	80.00
Total.....		240.00	Total.....		553.47
Township 2 North, Range 1 West: E/2 SW/4 NE/4.....	35	20.00	Township 3 South Range 2 East: Lot 8.....	6	35.49
Township 1 South, Range 1 West: NW/4 SE/4.....	6	40.00	SW/4 SW/4.....	25	40.00
Lot 3.....	7	40.51	SE/4 NW/4; E/2 SW/4.....	36	120.00
S/2 NE/4; NE/4 SE/4; W/2 SW/4 NW/4; W/2 NW/4 SW/4.....	16	160.00	Total.....		195.49
E/2 SE/4.....	17	80.00	Township 3 South Range 1 West: N/2 SE/4.....	3	80.00
E/2 NE/4.....	20	80.00	Lots 1-8, Incl.....	22	331.46
SE/4 SE/4.....	29	40.00	Lots 1-4, Incl; S/2 N/2.....	23	338.28
Lot 2.....	30	40.26	Lots 1-4, Incl; S/2 N/2.....	24	341.20
SW/4 NW/4; SW/4 SE/4.....	35	80.00	W/2 SE/4.....	25	80.00
SW/4 NE/4.....	36	40.00	Total.....		1,170.94
Total.....		600.77	Township 3 South Range 2 West: S/2 S/2.....	9	160.00
Township 1 South, Range 2 West: NW/4 SW/4.....	12	40.00	S/2 SE/4.....	7	80.00
S/2 NE/4; N/2 SE/4.....	14	160.00	SW/4 SW/4.....	8	40.00
Total.....		200.00	W/2 SW/4.....	15	80.00
Township 1 South, Range 3 West: SW/4 SE/4.....	8	40.00	NE/4 SW/4; NW/4; SE/4.....	16	360.00
NW/4 NW/4.....	16	40.00	SW/4 SW/4.....	17	40.00
Total.....		80.00	NE/4 NE/4.....	18	40.00
Township 1 South, Range 8 West: W/2 SW/4.....	3	80.00	N/2 NE/4.....	21	80.00
NE/4 SE/4.....	4	40.00	N/2 NW/4.....	24	80.00
All.....	5	721.00	W/2 SW/4.....	33	80.00
All.....	6	695.40	Total.....		1,040.00
NE/4 NW/4.....	10	40.00	Township 3 South Range 3 West: S/2 NW/4; NE/4 SW/4; N/2 SE/4.....	2	200.00
NE/4 SW/4.....	12	40.00	NW/4 SE/4; N/2 SW/4.....	17	120.00
SW/4 NW/4.....	14	40.00	All (Lots 1-4, Incl., E/2 W/2; E/2).....	19	633.87
Total.....		1,656.40	SW/4 SW/4.....	20	40.00
Township 2 South, Range 1 West: S/2 SW/4; SE/4 SE/4.....	1	120.00	E/2 SW/4.....	21	80.00
Lot 3; SE/4 NW/4.....	4	81.28	N/2 NW/4; S/2 NE/4; NE/4 SE/4.....	29	200.00
Lots 1 & 2; E/2 NW/4; W/2 NE/4.....	7	237.78	W/2 NE/4; NE/4 NW/4; Lot 1.....	30	158.66
NW/4 NW/4.....	12	40.00	Total.....		1,432.53
SE/4 NE/4.....	13	40.00	Township 3 South Range 4 West: SW/4 NW/4.....	11	40.00
Total.....		519.06	S/2 SE/4; SE/4 SW/4; N/2 S/2.....	13	280.00
Township 2 South, Range 1 East: Lot 2; SE/4 NW/4.....	18	79.71	NE/4; NE/4; NW/4.....	24	200.00
Township 2 South, Range 2 West: S/2 S/2.....	2	160.00	SE/4 NE/4; W/2 NE/4; E/2 NW/4.....	26	200.00
N/2.....	12	320.00	E/2 NE/4.....	30	80.00
Total.....		480.00	Total.....		800.00
Township 2 South, Range 3 West: E/2 NE/4.....	17	80.00	Township 3 South Range 5 West: Lots 1 & 2; SE/4 NE/4.....	3	118.86
NE/4 SW/4; S/2 SE/4.....	19	120.00	Lot 4; SW/4 NW/4; W/2 SW/4; SE/4 SW/4.....	2	199.58
NW/4 SW/4.....	29	40.00	S/2 NE/4; N/2 SE/4.....	5	160.00
Lots 1 & 2; E/2 NW/4; NE/4.....	30	316.36	NW/4; W/2 NE/4; SW/4; NW/4 SE/4.....	11	320.00
Lot 2; SE/4 NW/4.....	31	78.40	W/2 E/2.....	12	160.00
Total.....		634.76	SW/4 NW/4; N/2 SW/4; SW/4 SW/4.....	13	160.00
Township 2 South Range 4 West: SW/4 SW/4.....	1	40.00	E/2 NE/4.....	34	80.00
SE/4 SW/4; SW/4 SE/4.....	9	80.00	Total.....		1,358.44
W/2 NE/4.....	16	80.00	Township 3 South Range 7 West: Lots 3 & 4.....	7	66.55
NE/4.....	28	160.00	S/2.....	13	320.00
N/2 SE/4.....	32	80.00	NW/4 SW/4.....	16	40.00
Lots 3 & 4; N/2 SW/4.....	33	167.31	E/2 SE/4; SW/4 SE/4; W/2 NW/4.....	17	200.00
NE/4 SW/4; N/2 SE/4; Lots 1 & 2.....	36	200.46	E/2 NE/4; Lots 1 & 2.....	18	147.16
Total.....		807.77	Total.....		773.71
Township 2 South Range 5 West: NW/4.....	10	160.00	Township 3 South Range 8 West: E/2; NW/4; E/2 SW/4.....	35	560.00
NE/4 NE/4.....	29	40.00	S/2 S/2.....	1	160.00
N/2 NE/4; SE/4 NE/4.....	33	120.00	SW/4.....	2	160.00
W/2 NW/4; SE/4 NW/4; N/2 SW/4; SE/4 SW/4; S/2 SE/4.....	34	320.00	W/2 SE/4.....	3	80.00
NW/4 SE/4.....	36	40.00	Lot 3; SE/4 NW/4; NE/4 SW/4.....	6	120.04
Total.....		680.00	SE/4.....	9	160.00
Township 2 South Range 7 West: NE/4 SE/4; SW/4 SW/4.....	13	80.00	NE/4.....	10	160.00
NE/4 NE/4; SW/4 NW/4; N/2 SW/4; SE/4 SW/4; W/2 SE/4.....	14	320.00	S/2 NW/4.....	11	80.00
SE/4 SE/4.....	15	120.00	NW/4; SE/4.....	12	320.00
W/2 NE/4; SE/4 NE/4.....	23	80.00	N/2 NE/4; SE/4 NE/4; SE/4; NE/4 NW/4.....	13	320.00
N/2 NE/4.....	24	200.00	NE/4; S/2.....	14	480.00
Total.....		800.00	S/2.....	15	320.00
Township 2 South Range 8 West: SE/4 SW/4.....	31	40.00	W/2 NE/4; S/2 NW/4.....	27	160.00
			Total.....		3,080.04
			Township 3 South Range 9 West: SW/4 NW/4; NW/4 SW/4.....	27	80.00
			Township 4 South Range 2 West: Lot 3; NE/4 SW/4; N/2 SE/4.....	7	159.70
			E/2 NE/4; SW/4 NE/4.....	12	120.00
			E/2 NW/4; SW/4 NW/4.....	16	120.00
			SE/4 NE/4; NW/4; NW/4 SW/4; N/2 SE/4.....	17	320.00
			Lot 1.....	18	39.91
			SE/4; S/2 NE/4; S/2 SW/4.....	21	320.00
			S/2.....	22	320.00
			W/2 SW/4.....	23	80.00
			Lot 4.....	26	6.89

Description	Section	Acres	Description	Section	Acres
Township 4 South, Range 2 West—Continued			Township 4 South, Range 9 West—Continued		
Lots 1-4, Incl.	27	26.59	N/2	17	320.00
Lots 1-4, Incl.	28	126.64	Lots 3 & 4; E/2 SW/4; SE/4	18	319.09
Lots 1-6, Incl.; NE/4; E/2 NW/4	30	475.16	Lots 1 & 2; E/2 NW/4; NE/4	19	319.37
Total		2,114.89	Total		4,358.46
Township 4 South, Range 3 West:			Township 4 South Range 10 West:		
Lot 10	2	40.90	S/2	13	320.00
E/2 NE/4; NE/4 SE/4	13	120.00	SE/4 NW/4; E/2 SW/4	17	120.00
Lots 1 & 2; N/2 SE/4; SW/4; N/2	25	622.29	NE/4 NW/4	20	40.00
All	26	640.00	Total		480.00
Lots 1-6, Incl.; NW/4 NW/4	35	237.96	Township 5 South Range 7 West:		
Lot 1	36	25.75	S/2 SW/4	35	80.00
Total		1,686.90	Township 5 South Range 9 West:		
Township 4 South, Range 4 West:			SE/4 NW/4; S/2 NE/4	34	120.00
S/2	25	320.00	SW/4 NW/4	35	40.00
Township 4 South, Range 8 West:			Total		160.00
N/2	29	320.00	Township 6 South Range 9 West:		
Township 4 South, Range 9 West:			SW/4 SE/4	5	40.00
S/2	9	320.00	W/2 NE/4; NW/4 SE/4	8	120.00
All	10	640.00	Total		160.00
All	11	640.00	Grand total		
S/2	12	320.00			27,043.34
N/2; N/2 S/2; SE/4 SE/4	13	520.00			
N/2	14	320.00			
N/2	15	320.00			
N/2	16	320.00			

All such sales, exchanges, or other dispositions shall be made upon such terms as said committee and said authorized representatives shall deem satisfactory and may be made pursuant to bids or at private sale, and all funds or other property derived from such sales, exchanges, or other dispositions shall be subject to the terms of this act. Consent by the tribal business committee and said authorized representatives to the sale, exchange, or other disposal of the lands herein described shall relieve the United States of any liability resulting from such sale, exchange, or other disposition. The tribal business committee and said authorized representatives are further authorized to sell or dispose of tribal assigned lands to the assignees thereof under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the said tribal business committee and said authorized representatives with the assignees, subject, however, to the approval of the Secretary.

Sec. 10. The tribal business committee representing the full-blood group, and the authorized representatives of the mixed-blood group, within 60 days after the publication of the final membership roll, as provided in section 8 hereof, shall commence a division of the assets of the tribe that are then susceptible to equitable and practicable distribution. Such division shall be by agreement between them subject to the approval of the Secretary. Said division shall be based upon the relative number of persons comprising the final membership roll of each group. After such division the rights or beneficial interests in tribal property of each mixed-blood person whose name appears on the roll shall constitute an undivided interest in and to such property which may be inherited or bequeathed, but shall be subject to alienation or encumbrance before the transfer of title to such tribal property only as provided herein. Any contract made in violation of this section shall be null and void. If said groups are unable to agree upon said division within a period of 12 months from the date of such commencement, or any authorized extension of said period granted within the discretion of the Secretary, the Secretary is authorized to partition the assets of the tribe in such manner as in his opinion will be equitable and fair to both groups. Such partition shall give rise to no cause of action against the United States and the costs of such partition shall be paid by the tribe. The Secretary is authorized to provide such reasonable assistance as may be requested by both groups, or by either group, in formulation and execution of a plan for the

division of said assets, including necessary technical services of Government employees at Fort Duchesne, Utah, and arranging for necessary consultations with representatives of Federal departments and agencies, officials of the State of Utah, and political subdivisions thereof, and members of the tribe. All unadjudicated or unliquidated claims against the United States, all gas, oil, and mineral rights of every kind, and all other assets not susceptible to equitable and practicable distribution shall be managed jointly by the Tribal Business Committee and the authorized representatives of the mixed-blood group, subject to such supervision by the Secretary as is otherwise required by law, and the net proceeds therefrom after deducting the costs chargeable to such management shall first be divided between the full-blood and mixed-blood groups in direct proportion to the number of persons comprising the final membership roll of each group and without regard to the number of persons comprising each group at the time of the division of such proceeds.

Sec. 11. Notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, the tribal funds now on deposit or hereafter deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the tribe or either group thereof, shall be available for advance to the tribe or the respective groups, or for expenditure, for such purposes, including per capita payments, as may be designated by the Tribal Business Committee for the full-blood members, and by the authorized agents of the mixed-blood members, and in either event subject to the approval of the Secretary: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount of the expenditures and advances authorized by this section for the mixed-blood group shall not exceed 50 percent of the total funds of said mixed-blood group after such division, until said mixed-blood group has adopted a plan approved by the Secretary for termination of Federal supervision of said mixed-blood group, as required under section 13 hereof. After such termination of Federal supervision, per capita payments to the mixed-blood group shall not be subject to approval of the Secretary.

Sec. 12. Fifty percent of all per capita payments to any individual mixed-blood member made pursuant to any division or distribution hereunder shall have deducted therefrom any sum or sums of money owed by such member to the tribe, whether due or to become due, unless in the opinion of the Secretary said debts are not adequately secured in which event the entire per capita payment shall be subject to such offset. Any other division, partition, or distribution

of property to any individual mixed-blood member made pursuant to this act shall be subject to a mortgage to be made in favor of the tribe securing the payment of all sums of money owed by him to the tribe on the date of such division, partition, or distribution to such individual mixed-blood member. The Secretary shall require the execution of any mortgage required hereunder as a condition to any such division, partition, or distribution.

Sec. 13. After the adoption of a plan for the division of the assets between the two groups, a plan for distribution of the assets of the mixed-blood group to the individual members thereof shall be prepared and ratified by a majority of said group, within the period of 6 months from such adoption and presented to the Secretary for approval. The Secretary is authorized to provide such reasonable assistance, including necessary technical service of Government employees at Fort Duchesne, Utah, and arranging for necessary consultations with representatives of Federal departments and agencies, officials of the State of Utah and political subdivisions thereof, as may be required by the mixed-blood group in the preparation of such plan.

The plan for division of the assets among the members of the mixed-blood group may include:

(1) Complete disposition of all cash assets of said group, reserving, however, sufficient funds to cover—

(i) the proportionate share of said mixed-blood group in and to all expenses incurred in effecting the purposes of this act, including, but not limited to, the necessary expense incurred under sections 13 and 14 of this act;

(ii) the just and proportionate share of the mixed-bloods in the expense incurred in the prosecution of the claims of the tribe, or the bands thereof, against the United States; and

(iii) the determinable and estimated administrative costs and expenses of any mixed-blood organization authorized by this act, including lawful and reasonable salaries and fees of authorized agents, officers, and employees of said mixed-blood group.

(2) Partition of the lands of the mixed-blood group, excepting all gas, oil, and mineral rights, to corporations, partnerships, or other legal entities, and to trustees, and the individual members of said groups, quality and quantity relatively considered, according to the respective rights and interests of the parties, located so as to embrace, as far as practicable, any improve-

ments lawfully made by the person or persons receiving such land. The value of the improvements made, under a valid lease or assignment from the tribe, shall be excluded from the valuation in making allotments to the lessee or assignee, and the land must be valued without regard to such improvements unless the lease or assignment, under which said improvements were made, provided that such improvements should become the property of the tribe. In the making of any partition due consideration shall be given to all of the rights and interests of the person or persons receiving the property, and all of the rights and interests of the other members of the tribe. Two or more of the members of said mixed-blood group may obtain their share of property as tenants in common, as joint tenants, or in any other lawful manner when such members agree among themselves as to the manner in which they desire to receive such title. When it appears that an equitable partition cannot be made among the members of said mixed-blood group without prejudice to the rights and interests of some of them, and yet a partition is directed by the group, the members of said group may voluntarily determine compensation to be made by one party to another on account of the inequity. In all cases where equity is agreed upon by the members of said mixed-blood group, such compensatory adjustment among the parties, according to the principles of equity, must be approved by the Secretary. In the event of a failure to agree upon an equitable compensatory adjustment among the parties the Secretary shall make such adjustment and his decision shall be final.

(3) Organization of corporations for the grazing of livestock, handling of water and water rights, and the shares therein may be issued to the members of said group in proportion to their interests in the assets of such corporations. When, in the opinion of said mixed-blood group, it is to the best interest of said group to transfer a portion of the assets of said group to a corporation or other legal entity for any purpose, the Secretary is authorized to make such transfer.

(4) A transfer of assets to one or more trustees designated by said group who shall hold title to all or any part of the property of said group for management or liquidation purposes under terms and conditions prescribed by said mixed-blood groups. The Secretary is authorized to make such transfer, and approve the trustees, and the terms and conditions of the trust.

(5) Sale of any portion of the assets of said group subject to the approval of the Secretary. In addition to the sales herein otherwise authorized, authority is granted to the authorized representatives of said group to sell any property of said group when, in the opinion of the majority of said mixed-blood group, a practicable partition cannot be made, or for any other reason it is deemed to be the best interests of the group, and the proceeds of such sales shall be distributed equitably among the members of said mixed-blood group; after deducting reasonable cost of sale and distribution.

Sec. 14. In the event all the tribal assets, susceptible to equitable and practicable distribution, distributed to the mixed-blood group under the provisions of section 10 hereof, are not, within 7 years from the effective date of this act, distributed to the individual mixed-blood members as contemplated in the plan to be adopted in accordance with the provisions of section 13 hereof, so as to effectively terminate Federal supervision over said assets, then the Secretary shall proceed to make such distribution in a manner, in his discretion, deemed fair and equitable to all members of said group, or convey such assets to a trustee for liquidation and distribution of the net proceeds, or

convey such assets to the persons entitled thereto as tenants in common.

Sec. 15. Any member of the mixed-blood group may dispose of his interest in the tribal assets prior to termination of Federal supervision, subject to the approval of the Secretary. In the event a member of the mixed-blood group determines to dispose of his interest in any of said real property at any time within 10 years from the date of enactment of this act, he shall first offer it to the members of the tribe, and no sale of any interest, prior to termination of Federal supervision, shall be authorized without such offer to said members of the tribe in such form as may be approved by the Secretary. After termination of Federal supervision the requirement of such offer, in form to be approved by the Secretary, shall be a covenant to run with the land for said 10-year period, and shall be expressly provided in any patent or deed issued prior to the expiration of said period.

Sec. 16. (a) When any mixed-blood member of the tribe has received his distributive share of the tribal assets distributed to the mixed-blood group under the provisions of section 10 hereof, whether such distribution is made in part or in whole to a corporation, partnership, or trusteeship in which he is interested, or otherwise, the Secretary is authorized and directed to immediately transfer to him unrestricted control of all other property held in trust for such mixed-blood member by the United States, and shall further remove all restrictions on the sale or encumbrance of trust or restricted property owned by such member of the tribe, and Federal supervision of such member and his property shall thereby be terminated, except as to his remaining interest in tribal property in the form of any unadjudicated or unliquidated claims against the United States, all gas, oil, and mineral rights of every kind, and all other tribal assets not susceptible to equitable and practicable distribution, all of which shall remain subject to the terms of this act, notwithstanding anything herein contained to the contrary.

(b) Prior to the removal of restrictions in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) hereof on land owned by more than one person, the Secretary may—

(1) upon request of any of the owners, partition the land and issue to each owner an unrestricted patent or deed for his individual share, unless such owner is a full-blood member of the tribe or other Indian who owns trust or restricted property, in which event a trust patent or restricted deed shall be issued and such trust may be terminated or such restrictions may be removed when the Secretary determines that the need therefor no longer exists;

(2) upon request of any of the owners and a finding by the Secretary that partition of all or any part of the land is not practicable, cause all or any part of the land to be sold at not less than the appraised value thereof and distribute the proceeds of sale to the owners: *Provided*, That before a sale any one or more of the owners may elect to purchase the other interests in the land, or the tribe may elect to purchase the entire interest in the land, at not less than the appraised value thereof.

Sec. 17. No distribution of the assets made under the provisions of this act shall be subject to any Federal or State income tax: *Provided*, That so much of any cash distribution made hereunder as consists of a share of any interest earned on funds deposited in the Treasury of the United States shall not by virtue of this act be exempt from individual income tax in the hands of the recipients for the years in which paid. Property distributed to the mixed-blood group pursuant to the terms of this act shall be exempt from property taxes for a period of 7 years from the date of enactment of this act, unless the original distributee parts

with title thereto, either by deed, descent, succession, foreclosure of mortgage, sheriff's sale or other conveyance: *Provided*, That the mortgaging, hypothecation, granting of a right-of-way, or other similar encumbrance of said property shall not be construed as a conveyance subjecting said property to taxation under the provisions of this section. After 7 years from the date of enactment of this act, all property distributed to the mixed-blood members of the tribe under the provisions of this act and all income derived therefrom by the individual, corporation, or other legal entity, shall be subject to the same taxes, State and Federal, as in the case of non-Indians; except that any valuation for purposes of Federal income tax on gains or losses shall take as the basis of the particular taxpayer the value of the property on the date title is transferred by the United States pursuant to this act.

Sec. 18. The laws of the United States with respect to probate of wills, determination of heirship, and the administration of estates shall apply to the individual trust property of mixed-blood members of the tribe until Federal supervision is terminated. Thereafter, the laws of the several States, Territories, possessions and the District of Columbia within which such mixed-blood members reside at the time of their death shall apply.

Sec. 19. Nothing in this act shall affect any claim heretofore filed against the United States by the tribe, or the individual bands comprising the tribe.

Sec. 20. Nothing in this act shall abrogate any valid lease, permit, license, right-of-way, lien, or other contract heretofore approved.

Sec. 21. Nothing in this act shall abrogate any water rights of the tribe or its members.

Sec. 22. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary shall protect the rights of members of the tribe who are minors, non compos mentis, or, in the opinion of the Secretary, in need of assistance in conducting their affairs, by such means as he may deem adequate, but appointment of guardians pursuant to State laws, in any case, shall not be required until Federal supervision has terminated.

Sec. 23. Upon removal of Federal restrictions on the property of each individual mixed-blood member of the tribe, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a proclamation declaring that the Federal trust relationship to such individual is terminated. Thereafter, such individual shall not be entitled to any of the services performed for Indians because of his status as an Indian. All statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall no longer be applicable to such member over which supervision has been terminated, and the laws of the several States shall apply to such member in the same manner as they apply to other citizens within their jurisdiction.

Sec. 24. Within 3 months after the date of enactment of this act, the business committee of the tribe representing the full-blood group thereof shall present to the Secretary a development program calculated to assist in making the tribe and the members thereof self-supporting, without any special Government assistance, with a view of eventually terminating all Federal supervision of the tribe and its members. The tribal business committee, representing the full-blood group shall, through the Secretary of the Interior, make a full and complete annual progress report to the Congress of its activities, and of the expenditures authorized under this act.

Sec. 25. Nothing in this act shall affect the status of the members of the tribe as citizens of the United States, or shall affect their rights, privileges, immunities, and obligations as such citizens.

SEC. 26. The Secretary shall have authority to execute such patents, deeds assignments, releases, certificates, contracts, and other instruments, as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act, or to establish a marketable and recordable title to any property disposed of pursuant to this act.

SEC. 27. The Secretary is authorized to issue rules and regulations necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, and may, in his discretion, provide for tribal or group referenda on matters pertaining to management or disposition of tribal or group assets.

SEC. 28. Whenever any action pursuant to the provisions of this act requires the agreement of the mixed-blood and full-blood groups and such agreement cannot be reached, the Secretary is authorized to proceed in any manner deemed by him to be in the best interests of both groups.

SEC. 29. All acts, or parts of acts, inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed insofar as they affect the tribe or its members.

SEC. 30. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 8 through 11, strike all of subsection (b) and insert the following new language:

"(b) 'Full-blood' means a member of the tribe who possesses one-half degree of Ute Indian blood and a total of Indian blood in excess of one-half, excepting those who become mixed-bloods by choice under the provisions of section 4 hereof."

Page 2, lines 12 through 15, strike all of subsection (c) and insert the following new language:

"(c) 'Mixed-blood' means a member of the tribe who does not possess sufficient Indian or Ute Indian blood to fall within the full-blood class as herein defined, and those who become mixed-bloods by choice under the provisions of section 4 hereof."

Page 18, line 21, strike the words "effective date of" and insert in lieu thereof: "date of enactment of."

Page 24, strike all of section 25 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 25. Nothing in this act shall affect the status of the members of the tribe as citizens of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY TO ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9582) to provide for the transfer of excess property to the Territorial Government of Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, or any other provision of law, transfers of property excess to the needs of Federal agencies may be made to the Territorial Government of Alaska at the request of the Governor of Alaska without reimbursement or transfer of funds when such excess property is found by the Governor to be for operations or activities of the Territorial Government.

SEC. 2. The terms "property" and "excess property," as used in section 1 hereof, shall have the meaning now or hereafter ascribed to them in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That notwithstanding any provision of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, or any other provision of law, surplus personal property may be disposed of until December 31, 1956, to the Territorial government of Alaska at the request of the Governor of Alaska without reimbursement or transfer of funds when such surplus personal property is found by the Governor to be essential for the operations or activities of the Territorial government."

"SEC. 2. The terms 'property' and 'surplus property', as used in section 1 hereof, shall have the meaning now or hereafter ascribed to them in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the Territorial government of Alaska."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9988) for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to enable the Federal Republic of Germany to acquire and maintain a German Embassy in the District of Columbia, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$300,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5183) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and the same is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, notwithstanding any law, prior determination, statute of limitations, release, or prior acceptance of judgment of partial allowance, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans., against the United States on account of delinquent real-estate taxes for the tax years of 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947 assessed and levied against three tracts of land in sections 11 and 14 of township 28 south, range 1 east, of the sixth principal meridian, in Sedgwick County, Kans., constituting the aircraft factory and grounds, owned of record in such years by the Defense Plant Corporation and

the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and leased to the Boeing Airplane Co. and deeded on or about February 25, 1948, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the United States subject to unpaid taxes for said 4 years. Such court shall determine the amount of said taxes and interest thereon at the rate prescribed by the laws of Kansas for delinquent taxes, during the period to the 15th day of February 1948, and shall render judgment in favor of said Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans., and against the United States for that portion of the amount so determined which is in excess of the judgment in the amount of \$249,355.62 heretofore rendered by said court on July 15, 1952, in case No. 50117. The court shall have such jurisdiction if suit is instituted within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "Notwithstanding any law, prior determination, statute of limitations, or prior acceptance of judgment of partial allowance, the United States of America hereby accepts as a binding obligation and agrees to pay to the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans., from such funds as shall hereafter be appropriated for that purpose, the sum of \$259,925.09 as the unpaid balance of the base taxes assessed and levied for the tax years 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947, against three tracts of land in sections 11 and 14, of township 28 south, range 1 east of the sixth principal meridian in Sedgwick County, Kans., constituting the aircraft factory and grounds owned of record in such years by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and leased to the Boeing Airplane Co. and deeded on or about February 25, 1948, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the United States, subject to unpaid taxes for the years 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947.

"Payment of said sum shall be contingent upon and subsequent to the enactment by the Legislature of the State of Kansas of a law authorizing and directing the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans., to accept said amount as full payment of the unpaid balance of the base tax assessed and levied for the years aforesaid and as a release and forgiveness of all interests, penalties, liens, and charges on or in connection with said taxes."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 565) to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and authorize appropriations therefor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Public Resolution 42, 74th Congress, approved August 2, 1935, is amended to read as follows: "That in order to meet the obligations of the United States as a member of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State—

"(a) the sum of \$98,775 for payment by the United States of its assessed annual contri-

butions for the period beginning July 1, 1951, and extending through the fiscal year expiring June 30, 1954; and

"(b) such sums, not to exceed \$50,000 annually, as may be required thereafter for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Institute, as apportioned in accordance with the statutes of the Institute."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 472) to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 140, be considered in lieu of the House resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of 19 Commissioners as follows: The President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all ex officio; and 8 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, 4 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 4 Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare plans and a program for signaling the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton. In preparing such plans and program the Commission shall give due consideration to any plan or plans which may be submitted to it, and to take such steps as may be necessary to coordinate and correlate its plans with those prepared by State or civic bodies. If the participation of other nations in the commemoration is deemed advisable, the Commission may communicate to that end with the governments of such nations through the State Department.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members, and may employ, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

SEC. 5. When the Commission has approved a plan of celebration, it shall submit it, insofar as it relates to the fine arts, to the Commission of Fine Arts for its approval.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall, on or before March 1, 1955, make a report to the Congress in order that further enabling legislation may be enacted.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

SEC. 8. The Commission shall expire upon the completion of its duties, but in no event later than January 11, 1958.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that Senate Joint Resolution 140 be amended in accordance with the action of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House as indicated by the report accompanying House Joint Resolution 472.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

On page 2, line 13, after the words "nations," insert the words "through the State Department."

On page 3, line 5, substitute a comma for the period and insert the words "but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of \$10,000."

On page 3, line 9, substitute "1958" for "1959."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Joint Resolution 472 was laid on the table.

AMEND THE BANKRUPTCY ACT AS TO NOTICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8210) to amend subdivision (b) of section 14 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, relating to discharges, and subdivision (b) of section 58 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, relating to notices.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (b) of section 14 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) After the filing fees required to be paid by this act have been paid in full the court shall make an order fixing a time for the filing of objections to the bankrupt's discharge which shall be not less than 30 days after the first date set for the first meeting of creditors. Notice of such order shall be given to all parties in interest as provided in section 58b of this act. If the examination of the bankrupt concerning his acts, conduct, and property has not or will not be completed within the time fixed for the filing of objections to the discharge the court may, upon its own motion or upon motion of the receiver, trustee, a creditor, or any other party in interest or for other cause shown, extend the time for filing such objections. Upon the expiration of the time fixed in such order or of any extension of such time granted by the court, the court shall discharge the bankrupt if no objection has been filed; otherwise, the court shall hear such proofs and pleas as may be made in opposition to the discharge, by the trustee, creditors, the United States attorney, or such other attorney as the Attorney General may designate, at such time as will give the bankrupt and the objecting parties a reasonable opportunity to be fully heard."

SEC. 2. Subdivision (b) of section 58 of the Bankruptcy Act as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) The court shall give at least 30 days' notice by mail of the last day fixed by its order for the filing of objections to a bankrupt's discharge (1) to the creditors, in the manner prescribed in subdivision (a) of this section; (2) to the trustee if any and his attorney, if any, at their respective addresses as filed by them with the court; and (3) to the United States attorney of the judicial

district wherein the proceeding is pending. The court shall also give at least 30 days' notice by mail of the time and place of a hearing upon objections to a bankrupt's discharge (1) to the bankrupt, at his last known address as appears in his petition, schedules, list of creditors, or statement of affairs, or, if no address so appears, to his last known address as furnished by the trustee or other party after inquiry; (2) to the bankrupt's attorney, if any, at his address as filed by him with the court; and (3) to the objecting parties and their attorneys, at their respective addresses as filed by them with the court."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 509) to establish the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 147, be considered in lieu of the House resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the "Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of 11 members as follows:

(1) two members who shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) one member who shall be a Member of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(3) one member from the Department of the Interior who shall be the Director of the National Park Service, or his representative, and who shall serve as executive officer of the Commission; and

(4) 7 members to be appointed by the President, of whom 3 members shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the Governor of Virginia, 2 members shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the Woodrow Wilson Birthplace Foundation, Inc., and 2 members shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation.

(b) The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as chairman. The members of the Commission shall receive no salary but shall be reimbursed for their actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties.

SEC. 2. The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute suitable plans for the celebration in 1956, of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson in Staunton, Va. In carrying out these functions the Commission is authorized to cooperate with and to assist the commission established by the State of Virginia to plan a centennial celebration, in 1956, of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, and to invite all the people of the United States to join therein.

SEC. 3. The Commission may employ, without regard to civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with patriotic and historical societies and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purposes of this resolution. The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may procure supplies, services, and property, and make contracts and may exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this resolution.

(b) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the executive officer of the Commission, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account also for all funds received by the Commission. A report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress within 1 year following the celebration as prescribed by this resolution. The Commission shall terminate upon submission of its report to the Congress.

(c) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon termination of the celebration may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the National Park System or may be disposed of as surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,000 for travel expenses of the members of the Commission and for other expenses that may be incurred in developing suitable plans provided for herein, and there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution in accordance with such plans.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall expire on June 30, 1957.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that Senate Joint Resolution 147 be amended in accordance with the action of the Committee on the Judiciary report of the House as indicated by the report to accompany House Joint Resolution 509.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the word "nine" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twelve."

On page 1, line 9, strike out the words "One member who shall be a Member" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Two members who shall be Members."

On page 2, strike out all of lines 5 to 9, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

"(4) Seven members to be appointed by the President after consideration of such recommendations as may be made, upon the request of the President, by the Governor of Virginia as to three of such members, by the Woodrow Wilson Birthplace Foundation, Inc., as to two of such members, and by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation as to two of such members."

On page 2, line 23, after the name "Woodrow Wilson" insert a comma and the words "and to invite all the people of the United States to join therein."

On page 4, strike out all of lines 11, 12, and 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "no appropriation shall be deemed to be authorized herein to carry out the purposes of this resolution in accordance with such plans

unless an additional appropriation to carry out such purposes is expressly authorized by further legislation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Joint Resolution 509 was laid on the table.

SALE OR PLEDGE OF POSTAGE STAMPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7326) to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1721, title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 1721. Sale or pledge of stamps

"Whoever, being a postmaster or postal service employee—

"(1) uses or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards entrusted to his care or custody in the payment of debts or in the purchase of merchandise or other salable articles, or pledges or hypothecates the same, or sells or disposes of them except for cash;

"(2) sells or disposes of postage stamps or postal cards for any larger or less sum than the values indicated on their faces;

"(3) sells or disposes of stamped envelopes for a larger or less sum than is charged therefor by the Post Office Department for like quantities;

"(4) sells or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards at any point or place outside of the delivery of the office where such postmaster or other person is employed;

"(5) sells or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards, otherwise than as provided by law or the regulations of the Post Office Department; or

"(6) inflates or induces the inflation of the receipts of any post office or any station or branch thereof for the purpose of increasing the emoluments or compensation of the postmaster or any employee of any post office or any station or branch thereof,

Shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 1721, title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended as follows:

"In lines 2 and 3, strike out the words 'entrusted with the sale or custody of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards,' and insert in lieu thereof, 'knowingly and willfully:'

"In line 4, strike out the word 'then' and insert in lieu thereof 'postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards entrusted to his care or custody'.

"In line 18, after the word 'station' insert the words 'or branch'.

"In lines 18, 19, and 20, strike out 'or the allowances or facilities provided therefor, induces or attempts to induce any person to purchase at such' and insert in lieu thereof 'inflates or induces the inflation of the receipts of any'.

"In line 21, after the word 'station' insert the words 'or branch', and substitute a semicolon for the comma after the word 'thereof'.

"In lines 21, 22, and 23, strike out the words 'or from any employee of such post

office, postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards'.

"In line 26, substitute a semicolon for the comma after the word 'Department'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLIGHT TO AVOID PROSECUTION FOR ARSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7740) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1073 of title 18 of the United States Code, is amended by inserting "arson," after "weapon,"

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall take effect on the 30th day after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 4, after the word "arson," insert the following: "punishable as a felony."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATING NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7914) to incorporate the National Fund for Medical Education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is on the Speaker's desk S. 1748, introduced by the late Senator Taft, similar in purport and effect to H. R. 7914.

I ask unanimous consent that S. 1748 be taken from the speaker's desk, that all after the enacting clause be stricken and that there be substituted in lieu thereof the language of the committee amendment to H. R. 7914.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons: Donald C. Balfour, Rochester, Minn.; Margaret Culkin Banning, Duluth, Minn.; E. N. Beesley, Indianapolis, Ind.; James F. Bell, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mary McLeod Bethune, Daytona Beach, Fla.; Elmer H. Bobst, New York, N. Y.; Henry C. Brunie, New York, N. Y.; Earl Bunting, Washington, D. C.; Carl Byoir, New York, N. Y.; Colby M. Chester, New York, N. Y.; Champ Carry, Chicago, Ill.; Paul F. Clark, Boston, Mass.; Lucius D. Clay, New York, N. Y.; S. Sloan Colt, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.; William E. Cotter, Scarsdale, N. Y.; C. R. Cox, New York, N. Y.; Howard S. Cullman, New York, N. Y.; Walter J. Cummings, Chicago, Ill.

Raoul E. Desvernine, Washington, D. C.; Michael Francis Doyle, Philadelphia, Pa.; Victor Emanuel, New York, N. Y.; Theodore R. Gamble, New York, N. Y.; Bernard F. Gimbel, Greenwich, Conn.; William B. Given, Jr., New York, N. Y.; David M. Heyman, New York, N. Y.; Oveta Culp Hobby, Houston, Tex.; Herbert Hoover, New York, N. Y.; B. Brewster Jennings, Glen Head, N. Y.; Eric A. Johnston, Washington, D. C.; Devereux C. Josephs, New York, N. Y.; Meyer Kestnbaum, Chicago, Ill.; Allan B. Kline, Chicago, Ill.; Edgar Kobak, New York, N. Y.

Frank H. Lahey, Boston, Mass.; Robert Lehman, New York, N. Y.; Samuel D. Leidesdorf, New York, N. Y.; Leroy A. Lincoln, New York, N. Y.; Ralph Lowell, Boston, Mass.; Benjamin E. Mays, Atlanta, Ga.; Neil McElroy, Cincinnati, Ohio; George W. Merck, West Orange, N. J.; George G. Montgomery, San Francisco, Calif.; Seeley G. Mudd, Los Angeles, Calif.; Charles S. Munson, New York, N. Y.

Herschel D. Newsom, Washington, D. C.; Edward J. Noble, New York, N. Y.; William S. Paley, New York, N. Y.; Thomas I. Parkinson, New York, N. Y.; F. D. Patterson, Tuskegee, Ala.; Joseph M. Proskauer, New York, N. Y.; B. Earl Puckett, New York, N. Y.; Victor F. Ridder, New York, N. Y.; Owen J. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Winthrop Rockefeller, New York, N. Y.; Anna M. Rosenberg, New York, N. Y.; T. J. Ross, New York, N. Y.; Howard A. Rusk, New York, N. Y.

Lester N. Selig, Chicago, Ill.; Eustace Seligman, New York, N. Y.; Spyros P. Skouras, New York, N. Y.; Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., New York, N. Y.; Harold E. Stassen, Washington, D. C.; J. P. Stevens, Jr., New York, N. Y.; W. C. Stolk, New York, N. Y.; Juan T. Trippe, Greenwich, Conn.; Thomas J. Watson, New York, N. Y.; Ernest T. Weir, Pittsburgh, Pa.; George Whitney, New York, N. Y.; Robert E. Wilson, Chicago, Ill.; Robert W. Woodruff, Atlanta, Ga.; John S. Zinsser, Philadelphia, Pa.; and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of the National Fund for Medical Education (hereinafter referred to as the corporation) and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession of the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 2. The purposes of the corporation shall be to promote and foster the following objectives:

- (1) The interpretation of the needs of medical education to the American public;
- (2) The encouragement of the growth, development, and advancement of constantly improving standards and methods in the education and training of all medical manpower in the Nation;
- (3) The preservation of academic freedom in the institutions of medical education and the aiding of these institutions in offering the equality of educational opportunity to all those who are qualified to seek to enter the medical profession.

USE OF INCOME AND ASSETS

SEC. 3. No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, directors, or officers, or to any individual, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to officers of the corporation in amounts approved by the executive committee of the corporation.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 4. The corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elected public office.

TRUSTEES

SEC. 5. The directors of the corporation shall be termed trustees, and the first board

of trustees shall consist of the 13 persons whose names and addresses are as follows: Earl Bunting, Washington, D. C.; Colby M. Chester, New York, N. Y.; S. Sloan Colt, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.; William E. Cotter, Scarsdale, N. Y.; Victor Emanuel, New York, N. Y.; William B. Given, Jr., New York, N. Y.; Herbert Hoover, New York, N. Y.; Devereux C. Josephs, New York, N. Y.; Samuel D. Leidesdorf, New York, N. Y.; Leroy A. Lincoln, New York, N. Y.; Eustace Seligman, New York, N. Y.; Juan T. Trippe, Greenwich, Conn.; John S. Zinsser, Philadelphia, Pa.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE

SEC. 6. The principal office of the corporation shall be located in New York City, N. Y., but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to this place, but may be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

VOTING RIGHTS

SEC. 7. Each member of the corporation shall have the right to one vote at all meetings of the members of the corporation.

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 8. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after the discharge of all outstanding obligations, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation, shall be distributed in such manner as the board of trustees shall determine, subject to the provisions of section 3 above.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 9. The corporation shall have power—

- (1) to have succession by its corporate name;
- (2) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;
- (3) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;
- (4) to choose such officers, managers, and agents as the business of the corporation may require;
- (5) to ordain and establish, by action of the board of trustees, bylaws and regulations, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State in which such corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;
- (6) to contract and be contracted with;
- (7) to take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by, a corporation operating in such State;
- (8) to transfer and convey real or personal property; and
- (9) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, and issue bonds therefor, and secure same by mortgage subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 10. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 11. The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 12 (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance

with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than January 15 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such reports shall not be printed as public documents.

OFFICERS

SEC. 13. The officers of the corporation shall consist of a chairman of the board of trustees, a president, one or more vice presidents, a secretary and one or more assistant secretaries, and a treasurer and one or more assistant treasurers, and such other officers as shall be provided in the bylaws. The bylaws shall provide for the election of trustees annually at a meeting of the members of the corporation and for the election of the officers by the trustees.

BOOKS AND RECORDS

SEC. 14. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of accounts and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of trustees, and committees having any authority under the board of trustees; and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote or his agent or attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 15. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, nor to declare or pay any dividends.

LOANS TO OFFICERS OR TRUSTEES

SEC. 16. The corporation shall not make loans to its officers or trustees. Any trustee who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or trustee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the following persons: Donald C. Balfour, M. D., Rochester, Minn.; Louis H. Bauer, M. D., Hempstead, N. Y.; Margaret Culkin Banning, Duluth, Minn.; E. N. Beesley, Indianapolis, Ind.; James F. Bell, Minneapolis, Minn.; Eimer H. Bobst, New York, N. Y.; Earl Bunting, Washington, D. C.; Carl Byoir, New York, N. Y.; James L. Camp, Jr., Franklin, Va.; Champ Carry, Chicago, Ill.; Robert S. Cheek, Nashville, Tenn.; Colby M. Chester, New York, N. Y.; Frank A. Christensen, New York, N. Y.; Paul F. Clark, Boston, Mass.;

Lucius D. Clay, New York, N. Y.; S. Sloan Colt, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.; George H. Coppers, New York, N. Y.; William E. Cotter, Scarsdale, N. Y.; C. R. Cox, New York, N. Y.; Howard S. Cullman, New York, N. Y.; Walter J. Cummings, Chicago, Ill.; Willard K. Denton, New York, N. Y.; Raoul E. Desvernine, Washington, D. C.; Michael Francis Doyle, Philadelphia, Pa.;

"Victor Emanuel, New York, N. Y.; Peter M. Fraser, Hartford, Conn.; Bernard F. Gimbel, Greenwich, Conn.; William B. Given, Jr., New York, N. Y.; Robert M. Hanes, Winston-Salem, N. C.; David M. Heyman, New York, N. Y.; Oveta Culp Hobby, Houston, Tex.; Herbert Hoover, New York, N. Y.; B. Brewster Jennings, Glen Head, N. Y.; Eric A. Johnston, Washington, D. C.; Devereaux C. Josephs, New York, N. Y.; Meyer Kestnbaum, Chicago, Ill.; Edgar Kobak, New York, N. Y.; Allan B. Kline, Chicago, Ill.; Robert Lehman, New York, N. Y.; Samuel D. Leidesdorf, New York, N. Y.; Leroy A. Lincoln, New York, N. Y.; Ralph Lowell, Boston, Mass.; Benjamin E. Mays, Atlanta, Ga.; Neil McElroy, Cincinnati, Ohio; George W. Merck, West Orange, N. J.; Don G. Mitchell, New York, N. Y.; George G. Montgomery, San Francisco, Calif.; Seeley G. Mudd, M. D., Los Angeles, Calif.;

"Charles S. Munson, New York, N. Y.; Herschel D. Newsom, Washington, D. C.; Edward J. Noble, New York, N. Y.; William S. Paley, New York, N. Y.; Thomas I. Parkinson, New York, N. Y.; F. D. Patterson, Tuskegee, Alabama; Joseph M. Proskauer, New York, N. Y.; B. Earl Puckett, New York, N. Y.; Victor F. Ridder, New York, N. Y.; Owen J. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Winthrop Rockefeller, Little Rock, Ark.; Anna M. Rosenberg, New York, N. Y.; T. J. Ross, New York, N. Y.; Howard A. Rusk, M. D., New York, N. Y.; Frank P. Samford, Birmingham, Ala.; Lester N. Selig, Chicago, Ill.; Eustace Seligman, New York, N. Y.; Spyros P. Skouras, New York, N. Y.; Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., New York, N. Y.; George F. Smith, New Brunswick, N. J.; Harold V. Smith, New York, N. Y.; Harold E. Stassen, Washington, D. C.; John P. Stevens, Jr., New York, N. Y.; William C. Stolk, New York, N. Y.; Harvey B. Stone, M. D., Baltimore, Md.;

"Reese H. Taylor, Los Angeles, Calif.; Juan T. Trippie, Greenwich, Conn.; Thomas J. Watson, New York, N. Y.; Ernest T. Weir, Pittsburgh, Pa.; George Whitney, New York, N. Y.; Robert E. Wilson, Chicago, Ill.; R. W. Woodruff, Atlanta, Ga.; Wilson W. Wyatt, Louisville, Ky.; J. D. Zellerbach, San Francisco, Calif.; and John S. Zinsser, Philadelphia, Pa.; and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia, where its legal domicile shall be, by the name of the National Fund for Medical Education (hereinafter referred to as the corporation) and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House for debate, S. 1748, as amended by the language of H. R. 7914, as amended, would grant to the National Fund for Medical Education, to which, for the sake of brevity, I will hereinafter refer as the "fund," a Federal charter of incorporation.

The fund was first organized as a New York corporation on May 9, 1949, and President Eisenhower, then president of Columbia University, was instrumental

in its birth and growth. The sole purpose of the organization is to solicit, entirely from private sources, charitable contributions to promote the cause of medical education in America. The fund has during its short life worked closely in cooperation with the American Medical Education Foundation of the American Medical Association. The moneys collected are allocated among the 79 accredited medical schools of the Nation upon recommendations made by a grants review board. The membership of this board includes representatives, first, from the fund's advisory council; second, from the American Medical Association; and, third, from the Association of American Medical Colleges. As of July 1953, the fund had contributed among the 79 medical schools a total of \$4,764,152. In passing, it is most commendable to note that only 10 percent of the funds collected were used for administrative expenses.

Testifying in support of the measure were Mr. Chase Mellen, Jr., executive vice president of the fund; Dr. Louis H. Bauer, past president of the American Medical Association and now president of the American Medical Education Foundation; and Dr. Stanley E. Dorst, dean of the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine and president of the Association of American Medical Colleges. Quite extensive hearings were held and no witnesses appeared in opposition to the bill.

It was the consensus of opinion of these witnesses that, in order to provide the minimum financial assistance necessary to promote the cause of medical education in America, approximately \$10 million a year will be required. This figure constitutes the goal established by the fund. Without a Federal charter, it is feared that this goal may be unattainable.

In granting Federal charters, the Congress is careful to select only those organizations which are truly national in scope and purpose. The 79 accredited medical schools are no longer detached, isolated, provincial community institutions. Rather, they are an integrated, interdependent, national team. All of them have voluntarily bound themselves together under the joint supervision and control of the Association of American Medical Colleges and the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association. As such, they are dedicated, not merely to the local but to the national health.

Obviously, a Federal charter will expand the volume of national contributions. As long as the fund has only the charter of a particular State, contributors in other States will be reluctant to make a national contribution. Rather, local contributors feel bound to contribute only to local schools or to their alma maters. Moreover, industrial corporations which are domiciled in more than one State, are reluctant to make several small contributions to several medical schools in several States. In order not to prefer one school over another, many such corporations simply make no donations at all; whereas, they would be pleased to make a substantial

donation to a national organization, operating under a charter granted by the Congress of the United States.

Then, too, a benevolent organization with a national charter can attract more nationally known names as officers, directors, trustees, and so forth, drawn from every industrial and professional field, all of which helps to universalize the solicitation appeal.

I have in my file, a multitude of editorials and press clippings from newspapers all over the United States, endorsing the work of this organization. One of the incorporators, Hon. Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, has made a personal appeal for the enactment of this legislation. This is one bill which will not cost the United States one thin dime. More significantly, the bill grants Congressional sanction to the principle of self-help, encouraging a voluntary, nonprofit, federation of dedicated men and women to solicit money from private sources to advance the cause of medical education and thus, the national health of America.

I trust that it will be the will of the House to approve this measure.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7914) was laid on the table.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN WORLD WAR II LAWS RELATING TO RETURN OF FISHING VESSELS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 67) to repeal certain World War II laws relating to return of fishing vessels, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, effective upon the enactment of this joint resolution, the following statutory provisions are repealed:

(a) The act of April 29, 1943, entitled "An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto", as amended (Public Law 44, 78th Cong., 57 Stat. 69; Public Law 305, 78th Cong., 58 Stat. 223; Public Law 716, 79th Cong., 60 Stat. 976; 50 War App. U. S. C. 1301-1305).

(b) The act of August 10, 1946, entitled "An act relating to the sale by the United States of surplus vessels suitable for fishing" (Public Law 717, 79th Cong., 60 Stat. 977; 50 War App. U. S. C. 1306-1308). Notwithstanding the enactment of this joint resolution, the aforesaid statutory provisions shall apply to any vessels which prior to such enactment have been declared available for return to former owners by notice to the Department of Commerce under the act of April 29, 1943, as amended, or determined to be surplus for sale to former owners of fishing vessels in accordance with the act of August 10, 1946 (Public Law 717, 79th Cong.). Any other vessels which, but for the enactment of this joint resolution, would be disposed of in accordance with any of the aforesaid statutory provisions, shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of other existing laws.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASES IN ANNUITIES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3660) granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LIMITATION ON OUTPATIENT DENTAL CARE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9866) to prescribe certain limitations with respect to outpatient dental care for veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to offer an amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has an amendment which would extend the time limitation from 1 year to 2 years. It is my further understanding that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs approved a 1-year period unanimously. It seems to me that the 1-year period is adequate. Rather than have the 1-year period extended to 2 years, as I understand the gentleman from Louisiana wishes, I shall have to ask that the bill be passed over.

The independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1955 has a 1-year limitation. It takes care of the situation properly, in my judgment, although there are some improvements in the bill as set forth here. I should like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] if that is his intention; and if it is I intend to object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, my objection to it is the same as I have been arguing ever since I have been a Member of Congress. It does not give the veterans time to get their dental work done. I have contended for a 5-year period, but I would agree to go along with 2 years. However, I will not agree to anything less.

I attended the American Dental Association meeting when this matter was discussed and the conclusion was reached that a "reasonable" time should be granted. I gathered from the members to whom I talked that by a reasonable time, they meant a period of not less than 3 years, with 5 years being preferred. However, there is a group of dentists that insists on a 1-year period. I cannot go along with their way of thinking.

Many reasons could be cited why this does not give the veteran enough time to get his dental work done, thereby denying many of them the rights they are granted under the veterans' benefit laws already in force.

The law referred to by my colleague [Mr. FORD] was an amendment to the appropriation bill in the Senate. As you no doubt remember, the House defeated that same amendment. Next year, when the appropriation bill comes before the Congress, we will defeat it again, and I hope the Senate will do likewise.

I cannot, in good conscience, go along with a program that I know is not in the best interests of the men who have fought our wars.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering today, H. R. 9866, represents permanent legislation to replace what has been controlled largely by riders in the independent offices appropriation bills for the past 2 years.

This measure, which I introduced, was reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs after full hearings. We heard testimony from the Veterans' Administration, from the American Dental Association and from all the national veterans' organizations. No objections of any substance were raised by any witnesses. This bill is recommended by the Veterans' Administration, and carries the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

This bill limits out-patient dental treatment to veterans with disabilities which are, first, service-connected and compensable in degree; or second, service-connected and shown to have been in existence at time of discharge, and where application for treatment is made within 1 year after discharge, or December 31, 1954, whichever is the later; or third, is associated with and aggravating a disability for some other service-connected injury or disease.

The bill also provides, in accordance with a practice which now prevails in the Veterans' Administration, that treatment is on a one-time-completion basis only, except in those cases where the standard of work performed does not meet the professional requirements of good dental treatment. The one-time treatment requirement would not apply to dental disabilities of former prisoners of war or to those suffering from combat wounds.

In accordance with the Public Law 494 which I also sponsored, and which was signed by President Eisenhower last July 15, this bill does not limit treatment given to Spanish-American War veterans. The veterans of the Spanish-American war are given special consideration with respect to out-patient care. Neither does this bill restrict dental care given to veterans undergoing education or training under Public Law 16, the law which provides such education for serv-

ice-connected veterans of World War II and Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as part of my remarks the language of Public Law 494, dealing with free dental care for our Spanish-American War veterans:

[Public Law 494, 83d Cong., ch. 506, 2d sess.]
H. R. 6412

An act to preserve the eligibility of certain veterans to dental out-patient care and dental appliances

Be it enacted, etc., That veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion, and veterans in training under Public Law 16, 78th Congress, as amended and extended, shall not be subject to the limitation on outpatient dental care contained in the first proviso of the provision under the heading "Out-patient care" appearing under the heading "Veterans' Administration" in the Second Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1954, or in the first proviso under the same heading in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 428, 83d Cong., 2d sess.).

Approved July 15, 1954.

In addition, I should like to indicate the effect which the passage of this bill, H. R. 9866, would have on Veterans Regulation No. 7 (a), and on the Independent offices appropriations acts:

[Committee print]

While not required under the Ramseyer rule, for the convenience of the Members of the House the effect of enactment of this bill is set forth below (new matter in italics; matter to be repealed in black brackets):

"VETERANS REGULATION NO. 7 (A)

"ELIGIBILITY FOR MEDICAL CARE

"I. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilities, is authorized in his discretion to furnish to honorably discharged veterans of any war, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, and to men honorably discharged from the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for disabilities incurred in line of duty, such medical, surgical and dental services as may be found to be reasonably necessary for diseases or injuries incurred or aggravated in the line of duty in the active military or naval service. Such persons may also be furnished with such supplies including dental appliances, wheel chairs, artificial limbs, trusses, and similar appliances, including special clothing made necessary by the wearing of prosthetic appliances, as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may determine to be useful and reasonably necessary, which dental appliances, wheel chairs, artificial limbs, trusses, special clothing, and similar appliances may be procured by the Veterans' Administration in such manner, either by purchase or manufacture, as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may determine to be advantageous and reasonably necessary.

"No outpatient dental services and treatment, or related dental appliances, shall be furnished by authority of the provisions of this Veterans Regulation No. 7 (a), or the provisions of section 6, Public Act No. 2, 73d Congress, as amended, unless the dental condition or disability (1) is service connected and of compensable degree; or (2) is service connected, shown to have been in existence at time of discharge and application for treatment is made within 1 year after discharge or by December 31, 1954, whichever is the later; or (3) is associated with and held to be aggravating disability from some other disease or injury which was incurred in, or aggravated by, service: *Provided, That the*

foregoing limitations shall not apply to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion, nor shall they be construed to restrict the authority provided by Public Law 16, 78th Congress, as amended and extended, to furnish dental services to veteran trainees thereunder: *Provided further, That benefits (except for a dental condition or disability due to combat wounds or other service trauma or of a former prisoner of war) afforded under clause (2) shall be on a one-time completion basis only, unless the services rendered on a one-time basis are found unacceptable within the limitations of good professional standards, in which event such additional limited services may be afforded as are required to complete professionally acceptable treatment.*"

Outpatient care section (Veterans' Administration) of Public Law 149, 83d Congress: "Outpatient care: For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, as authorized by law, including not to exceed \$196,000 for expenses of travel of employees; \$92,667,900, of which not exceeding \$23 million shall be available for outpatient fee basis dental care: *Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for outpatient dental services and treatment, or related dental appliances with respect to a service-connected dental disability which is not compensable in degree unless such condition or disability is shown to have been in existence at time of discharge and application for treatment is made within 1 year after enactment of this act: Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to adjunct outpatient dental services or appliances for any dental condition associated with and held to be aggravating disability from some other service incurred or service aggravated injury or disease.*"

Outpatient care section (Veterans' Administration) of Public Law 428, 83d Congress: "Outpatient care: For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, as authorized by law, including not to exceed \$178,000 for expenses of travel of employees; \$82,134,000, of which not exceeding \$11,200,000 shall be available for outpatient fee basis dental care: *Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for outpatient dental services and treatment, or related dental appliances with respect to a service-connected dental disability which is not compensable in degree unless such condition or disability is shown to have been in existence at time of discharge and application for treatment is made within 1 year after discharge or by December 31, 1954, whichever is later: Provided further, That this limitation shall not apply to adjunct outpatient dental services or appliances for any dental condition associated with and held to be aggravating disability from such other service-incurred or service-aggravated injury or disease.*"

The only objection raised to this bill is that represented by the amendment which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] now seeks to offer. The gentleman from Louisiana desires to extend the proposed 1-year period, within which an application for free dental care must be filed, to 2 years. Previously he has opposed any time limitation, or one of not less than 5 years.

First of all I should like to point out that this extension of time is in conflict with the unanimous decision of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, of which the gentleman from Louisiana is a distinguished member. It seems apparent that 1 year is a reasonable length of time in which to seek free dental treatment.

The Members will note that it is only necessary to file an application within 1 year, not to have received treatment.

Secondly, it has been made plain that this bill cannot pass today if this amendment is offered. If permanent legislation is not enacted, as now seems likely, the provisions of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act will apply. The result will be that the 1 year time limit will be in effect, but not as the result of the considered recommendation of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Because of disagreement on a less than vital point, needed legislation will not be passed. Inclusive consideration has been given to this problem of outpatient dental care, and I should be reluctant to see this bill passed over.

This measure would not lead to any additional cost on the part of the Veterans' Administration. In fact, it will continue to save considerable money over the procedure in effect prior to the enactment of the appropriation riders.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Louisiana if we did not, in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, have a full discussion about the reasonableness of the 1-year period? When the bill was reported favorably by a unanimous vote of the committee, I regret that the gentleman from Louisiana was not there.

I, too, would be reluctant to accept the 2-year limitation, because it seems to me that the 1-year limitation is a reasonable time. It is sufficient warning that unless eligible veterans apply they will not have free dental care. I am reluctant to see the bill passed over because one Member now proposes that an amendment be adopted to extend it to 2 years. I do not suggest, however, that such a period might not also be considered reasonable.

I would suggest to the gentleman that perhaps permanent legislation on this subject is important. In any event the appropriation rider will be in effect unless this legislation passes, so this proposed 2-year limitation will not apply if the bill is passed over.

Mr. FORD. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the legislation as unanimously recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I will insist on having the bill passed over unless it is agreed beforehand that such an amendment will not be offered. I respectfully ask the gentleman from Louisiana if that is his intention.

Mr. LONG. I do not understand what the gentleman is driving at.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands it, the gentleman from Michigan is requesting the gentleman from Louisiana not to offer his amendment to extend it to 2 years. Is that the subject of the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. FORD. The Chair is correct. If the gentleman from Louisiana is going to offer his amendment, I will then ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LONG. I offer the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I object to the bill being passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot offer his amendment until permission is granted for the bill to be considered, which has not been given.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LONG. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana objects.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. I object to the present consideration of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

PANAMA CANAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2305) to extend to certain naturalized citizens of the United States the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CHARTER OF PASSENGER SHIPS IN DOMESTIC TRADE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9868) to amend the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to provide for the charter of passenger ships in the domestic trade.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (e) (1) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 41), as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "may be chartered pursuant to the act for bareboat use in any service" the following: "including the domestic trade in the case of passenger ships."

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 5 (f) (1) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'and may charter any war-built passenger vessel owned by the United States for use in the domestic trade of the United States, under the conditions prescribed for the charter of war-built cargo vessels in subsection (e) of this section.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENIAL OF FEDERAL ANNUITIES TO GOVERNMENT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES CONVICTED OF CERTAIN CRIMES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9909) to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides exemptions from its provisions with respect to convicted criminals and traitors who are presently drawing retirement annuities. It had been my intention to offer amendments to the bill striking out the exemption of those people, because I do not believe convicted criminals should draw any retired pay from the United States. We do not owe them anything. However, the other provisions of the bill I think should be enacted anyway. I understand if I offered the amendments at this time the bill would probably not get through at this session. I make this statement because it had been announced that I would offer those amendments.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall not be paid to any person convicted prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this act of any of the following offenses described in this section, or to the survivor or beneficiary of such person so convicted, for any period subsequent to the date of such conviction or the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person as an officer or employee of the Government:

(1) Any offense defined in section 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, or 223 of chapter 11 (relating to bribery and graft), section 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, or 287 of chapter 15 (relating to claims and services in matters affecting government), section 434, 435, 436, 441, 442, or 443 of chapter 23 (relating to contracts), chapter 37 (relating to espionage and censorship), section 1700, 1702, 1703, 1704, 1705, 1706, 1707, 1708, 1709, 1711, or 1712 of chapter 83 (relating to offenses involving the postal service), chapter 105 (relating to sabotage), or chapter 115 (relating to treason, sedition, and subversive activities) of title 18 of the United States Code or in section 10 or 16 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (42 U. S. C., secs. 1810 and 1816);

(2) Any offense (not including any offense within the purview of section 13 of title 18 of the United States Code) which is a felony under the laws of the United States or of the District of Columbia (A) committed in the exercise of his authority, influence, power, or privileges as an officer or employee of the Government, or (B) committed after the termination of his service as an officer or employee of the Government but directly involving, directly resulting from, or directly relating to, the improper exercise of his authority, influence, power, or privileges during any period of his service as such an officer or employee;

(3) Perjury committed under the laws of the United States or of the District of Columbia (A) in falsely denying the commission of an act which constitutes any of the offenses described in paragraph (1) or (2) of this section, (B) in falsely testifying before any Federal grand jury or court of the United States with respect to his service as an officer or employee of the Government, or (C) in falsely testifying before any congressional committee in connection with any matter under inquiry before such congressional committee; or subornation of perjury committed in connection with the false denial or false testimony of another person as specified in this paragraph.

(4) Any offense defined in section 833, 861, or 862 of an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia" approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1330, D. C. Code, 1954 edition, secs. 22-1201, 122-701, 22-703); or in the second paragraph under the subheading "for executive office" under the caption "general expenses" in the first section of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 591, D. C. Code, 1901 edition, sec. 22-702).

SEC. 2. (a) There shall not be paid to any person who has failed or refused, or fails or refuses, prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this act, upon the ground of self-incrimination, to appear, testify, or produce any book, paper, record, or other document, with respect to his service as an officer or employee of the Government or with respect to any relationship which he has had or has with a foreign government, in any proceeding before a Federal grand jury, court of the United States, or congressional committee, or to the survivor or beneficiary of such person, for any period subsequent to the date of such failure or refusal of such person on the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person as an officer or employee of the Government. There shall not be paid to any such person, or to his survivor or beneficiary, for any period subsequent to the date of such failure or refusal or the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later, any salary, pay, or compensation for service as an officer or employee of the Government; and any such person who occupies an office or position in the service of the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia shall be removed therefrom and thereafter prohibited from holding any office or position in or under the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia.

(b) There shall not be paid to any person who, prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this act, has made or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, or who, prior to, on, or after such date, has concealed or conceals any material fact, with respect to his—

(1) past or present membership in, affiliation or association with, or support of the Communist Party, or any chapter, branch, or subdivision thereof, in or outside the United States, or any other organization, party, or group, or any individual, advocating (A) the overthrow, by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means, of the Government of the United States, (B) the establishment in the United States of a Communist totalitarian dictatorship, or (C) the right to strike against the Government of the United States;

(2) conviction of any offense described in the first section of this act; or

(3) failure or refusal to appear, testify, or produce any book, paper, record, or other document as specified in subsection (a) of this section,

for any period subsequent to the date of enactment of this act or the date on which such statements are made, whichever is later, in connection with his application for an office or position in or under the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia, or to the survivor or beneficiary of such person, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person as an officer or employee of the Government.

SEC. 3. In the case of any such person, any amounts contributed by him toward the annuity the benefits of which are denied

under this act, less any sums previously refunded or paid as annuity benefits, shall be returned, upon appropriate application therefor, to such person, with interest to date of conviction or the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later, at such rates as may be provided in the case of refunds under the law, regulation, or agreement under which the annuity is payable, or if no such rates are so provided at the rate of 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year. In the event a person entitled to a refund under this section dies prior to the making of such refund, the refund shall be made to such person or persons as may be provided in the case of refunds under the law, regulation, or agreement under which the annuity the benefits of which are denied under this act is payable or, if no such provision is made, in the order of preference prescribed in section 12 (e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, as amended.

SEC. 4. No accountable officer of the Government of the United States or of the government of the District of Columbia shall be held responsible for payments made in violation of the first section and section 2 of this act when made in due course and without negligence.

SEC. 5. As used in this act—

(1) The term "officer or employee of the Government" includes an officer or employee in or under the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, a Member of or Delegate to Congress, a Resident Commissioner, an officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia, and a member or former member of the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Regular and Reserve components thereof, the Fleet Reserve, the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service.

(2) The term "annuity" means any retirement benefit (other than any benefit provided under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration) payable by any department or agency of the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia upon the basis of service as a civilian officer or employee, except that such term does not include salary or compensation which may not be diminished under section 1 of article III of the Constitution or, in the case of a benefit payable under the Social Security Act, as amended, any portion of such benefit not based upon service as an officer or employee of the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia. The term "annuity" does not include any retirement benefit of any person to whom such benefit has been awarded or granted prior to the date of enactment of this act insofar as concerns the conviction of such person, prior to such date, of any offense specified in the first section of this act or the failure or refusal of such person, prior to such date, to appear, testify, or produce any book, paper, record, or other document as specified in section 2 (a) of this act.

(3) The term "retired pay" means retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay (other than any benefit provided under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration), payable under any law of the United States to members or former members of the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Regular and Reserve components thereof and the Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service. The term "retired pay" does not include the retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay of any person to whom any such pay has been awarded or granted prior to the date of enactment of this act insofar as concerns the conviction

of such person, prior to such date, of any offense specified in the first section of this act, or the failure or refusal of such person, prior to such date, to appear, testify, or produce any book, paper, record, or other document as specified in section 2 (a) of this act.

Sec. 6. This act shall not be construed as restricting authority under any other provision of law to deny or withhold benefits authorized by law.

Sec. 7. The President may drop from the rolls any member of the Armed Forces, including the Regular and Reserve components thereof, the Fleet Reserve, and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, and any member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey or of the Public Health Service, who is deprived of retired pay under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 8. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 14, strike out "paragraph." and insert in lieu thereof "paragraph;"

Page 3, strike out line 15 and all that follows down to the semicolon in line 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Any offense defined in section 833, 861, or 862 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia', approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1325, 1330; D. C. Code, 1951 edition, secs. 22-1201, 22-701, 22-703)."

Page 4, lines 1 and 2, strike out "(32 Stat. 591, D. C. Code, 1901 edition, sec. 22-702)." and insert in lieu thereof "(32 Stat. 591; D. C. Code, 1951 edition, sec. 22-702)."

Page 4, line 14, strike out "on" and insert in lieu thereof "or."

Page 4, strike out line 17 and all that follows down through the period on page 5, line 2.

Page 5, line 4, insert "knowingly and willfully" after "act."

Page 5, line 12, strike out ", or any individual."

Page 5, line 24, strike out "on which such statements are made" and insert in lieu thereof "on which any such statement, representation, or concealment of fact is made or occurs."

Page 6, strike out line 8 and all that follows down through the word "later" in line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 3. Any amounts contributed by any such person toward the annuity the benefits of which are denied under this act, less any sums previously refunded or paid as annuity benefits, shall be returned to such person, upon appropriate application therefor, with interest to the date of his conviction of any offense described in the first section of this act or of the commission by him of any violation of section 2 of this act, as the case may be, or the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later."

Page 6, line 20, after "year." insert the following: "Such person shall not be required to repay any annuity properly received by him which is in excess of the amount of his own contributions with interest."

Page 7, after line 3, insert the following:

"Sec. 4. The right to receive an annuity or retired pay shall be deemed restored to any person convicted, prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this act, of an offense which is specified in the first section of this act or which constitutes a violation of section 2 of this act, for which he is denied an annuity or retired pay, to whom a pardon of such offense is granted by the President of the United States, prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this act, and to the survivor or beneficiary of such person. Such restoration of the right to receive an annuity

or retired pay shall be effective as of the date on which such pardon is granted. Any amounts refunded to such person under section 3 of this act shall be redeposited before credit is allowed for the period or periods of service covered by the refund. No payment of annuity or retired pay shall be made for any period prior to the date on which such pardon is granted."

Page 7, line 4, strike out "Sec. 4." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 5."

Page 7, line 7, strike out "and" and insert in lieu thereof "or."

Page 7, line 7, after the word "when", insert "such payments are."

Page 7, line 9, strike out "Sec. 5." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 6."

Page 8, strike out all of line 12 after the word "act" and all that follows down through the period in line 15 and insert in lieu thereof ", or the commission by such person, prior to such date, of any violation of section 2 of this act."

Page 9, strike out all of line 5 after "act," and all that follows down through the period in line 8 and insert in lieu thereof "or the commission by such person, prior to such date, of any violation of section 2 of this act."

Page 9, line 9, strike out "Sec. 6." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 7."

Page 9, line 12, strike out "Sec. 7." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 8."

Page 9, line 18, strike out "Sec. 8." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 9."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of bills eligible for consideration on the Consent Calendar at this time.

ALABAMA AND COUSHATTA TRIBES OF INDIANS OF TEXAS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the bill (S. 2744) to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Indians of Texas, and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes, was placed at the foot of the calendar and I believe we are now ready to take up that bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the State of Texas the lands held in trust by the United States for the tribe of Indians organized and known as the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Texas, located in Polk County, Tex.; and such tribe is authorized to convey to the State of Texas the lands purchased for and deeded to the Alabama Indians in accordance with an act of the legislature of the State of Texas approved February 3, 1854, located in Polk County, Tex. All of the lands so conveyed shall be held by the State of Texas in trust for the benefit of the Indians of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Texas, subject to such conditions regarding management and use as the State of Texas may prescribe and the disposition of such lands shall be subject to approval of a majority of the adult members of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Texas.

SEC. 2. Upon the conveyance to the State of Texas of the lands held in trust by the United States for the Alabama and Coushat-

ta Tribes of Texas, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a proclamation declaring that the Federal trust relationship to such tribe and its members has terminated. Thereafter such tribe and its members shall not be entitled to any of the services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians: *Provided*, That after the date of this act such Indians shall be eligible for admission, on the same terms that apply to other Indians, to hospitals and schools maintained by the United States in the State of Oklahoma.

SEC. 3. Effective on the date of the proclamation provided for in section 2 of this act, all powers of the Secretary of the Interior or any other officer of the United States to take, review, or approve any action under the constitution and bylaws of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Texas approved on August 19, 1938, pursuant to the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), are terminated. Any powers conferred upon the tribe by its constitution and bylaws that are inconsistent with the provisions of this act are terminated. Such termination shall not affect the power of the tribe to take any action under its constitution and bylaws that is consistent with this act without the participation of the Secretary or other officer of the United States in such action.

SEC. 4. The indebtedness of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Texas to the United States, incurred under the provisions of the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 883, 900), is canceled, effective on the date of the proclamation to be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 5. The corporate charter of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Texas issued pursuant to the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), ratified on October 17, 1934, is revoked, effective on the date of the proclamation to be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 6. On and after the date of the proclamation to be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this act, all statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall no longer be applicable to the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Texas or the members thereof, except as provided in section 2 of this act, and the laws of the several States shall apply to the tribe and its members in the same manner as they apply to other citizens or persons within their jurisdiction.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall affect the status of the members of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Texas as citizens of the United States, or shall affect their rights, privileges, immunities, and obligations as such citizens.

SEC. 8. The act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended by the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 387), shall not apply to the tribe and its members after the date of the proclamation to be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, strike all of section 7, and insert in lieu thereof the words:

"Sec. 7. Nothing in this act shall affect the status of the members of the tribes as citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dowdy: On page 2, line 21, after "United States", insert a period and strike out the remainder of line 21.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLACK CANYON IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Consent Calendar No. 514, the bill (H. R. 9630) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory contract with the Black Canyon Irrigation District, Idaho, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to these bills that have been going through with great regularity after the Government has made contracts on these reclamation and irrigation projects. If the contract is for a period of 50 years, legislation is later introduced to extend the contracts to 75 years. Now it would appear as if eventually these contracts may be extended in perpetuity. If these contracts are not valid when they are entered into, we certainly should not be compelled to grant an extension of time. These projects ought to be amortized on a sound basis when the contract is entered into. In the future any of these authorizations to extend the time of payments another 25 years is going to be passed over my objection. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Budge]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to execute on behalf of the United States the amendatory repayment contract with the Black Canyon Irrigation District, Idaho, negotiated pursuant to section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1192; 43 U. S. C., 1946 edition, sec. 485f) and approved by the District's electors on April 20, 1954.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is further authorized, on the basis of the principles set forth in the revised allocation and repayment report for the Boise Federal reclamation project, Idaho, dated September 21, 1953 (which report is in part the basis upon which the above-described amendatory repayment contract was negotiated), and subject to then existing contractual obligations of the United States in relation to the Boise project (1) to coordinate his operation of the facilities of the project with that of other Federal installations on the Boise and Pay-

ette Rivers, (2) to allocate an appropriation portion of the construction cost and of the operation and maintenance costs of the project to each of the functions (primarily irrigation, including irrigation power, commercial power, and flood control) served by it, and (3) to account for the return of the reimbursable allocations in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws.

SEC. 3. The last 3 provisos to the portion of the act of June 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 390, 416), relating to the Boise project, and the proviso to the portion of the act of March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1562, 1590), also relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. As used in this act, the term "Federal reclamation laws" means the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

SEC. 5. This act is declared to be a supplement of the Federal reclamation laws.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 10, strike out "appropriation" and insert "appropriate."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER STORAGE FACILITIES

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, the bill (S. 3137) to make the provisions of the act of August 27, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semi-arid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate to amendments of House thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and Senate amendments, as follows:

After the word "farming", insert a comma. In line 6 strike out the word "improvement" and insert "improved."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas a few questions, not related to the bill, and about which I am anxious to get some information. I would have asked them if another bill on the calendar had not been passed over.

There is a bill that has passed the Senate that would put coffee under the Commodity Exchange Act. Also another bill that passed the House to include onions which has a Senate amendment to include coffee which is now on the Speaker's desk.

Can the gentleman enlighten me if it is the intention of the gentleman or his committee to take any action on including coffee at this session of the Congress?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to say to the gentleman that the committee has been studying the recent report of the Fed-

eral Trade Commission on that subject, with the thought of determining whether or not legislation that is pending would in any way meet with the recommendations that are made by the Federal Trade Commission. We have discussed the matter in the committee no later than this forenoon. While the committee has not arrived at any specific decision thereon, it appears that the recommendations of the Federal Trade Commission would call for considerably broader legislative enactment than is contained in the legislation now pending before the Congress. The feeling of the gentleman from Kansas is that the committee should give further study to this entire question before taking any action on the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. That would mean there would be no action taken at this session of the Congress to put coffee under the Commodity Exchange Act?

Mr. HOPE. I think it would be impossible, owing to the fact that the session is nearing the end, to take action which would enable us to study or carry out the recommendations made by the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. McCORMACK. But does the gentleman think that this particular matter should be held up so that proper study of the Federal Trade Commission's report and recommendation, which enables control of gambling and speculation to be regulated to some extent? It seems to me that it is very evident there has been tremendous speculation in coffee, and it is a simple question whether or not coffee should be put under the Commodity Exchange Act.

Mr. HOPE. On the contrary, may I say to the gentleman the committee held extensive hearings a number of weeks back on this question. Frankly, the proponents of legislation to put trading in coffee under the regulation of the Commodity Agency in the Department of Agriculture, in the opinion of members of the committee with whom I have talked failed to make out a case in that respect. I do not say that is necessarily the conclusion the committee might come to after further study. But certainly a very weak case was made out for the legislation at that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is there any doubt in the gentleman's mind but what there has been tremendous speculation in coffee in the past year or so?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. The evidence before the committee indicated that there was very little speculation in coffee on the futures market, and all of the trading took place and all of the speculation, if you call it that, was on the spot market. I might call the gentleman's attention to the fact that during this entire period when the price of coffee was going up the futures market on coffee was considerably below the spot market, which would indicate that the manipulation and speculation, or whatever it was that was going on, was in the spot market and not in the futures market. These are all matters the committee has given consideration to. Of course, we all realize that some things have been taking place entirely outside of this country that have more to do with the increase in the price

of coffee than anything that could possibly have happened in this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am somewhat amazed at the gentleman's statement that there is very little speculation taking place in coffee in the last year, because certainly the impression I had was distinctly to the contrary, and I thought the evidence was to the contrary.

Mr. HOPE. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to have the gentleman read the hearings before our committee. I believe he will agree that they support the statement I have made that a very weak case was made out for placing trading in coffee under the regulation of the authority of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McCORMACK. I take it from the gentleman's remarks that there is no hope of the Senate amendment being brought up unless it would be by unanimous consent or under a rule from the Committee on Rules enabling the House to vote on the question of whether or not coffee should be covered by the Commodity Exchange Act.

Mr. HOPE. I want to say that the committee intends to pursue this matter further. We intend to go to the very bottom of it, but I am not at all certain that it can be done during the remainder of this session. I do not think we have an opportunity to get at the real question which is involved here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for raising the question. It seems to me that the Federal Trade Commission report indicated that something ought to be done. Unless however the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture agrees to take the bill from the Speaker's desk with the amendment, I do not see how it can be done during the present session.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The housewives of the country are being fleeced every day.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to say with respect to the amendment on coffee which was added in the Senate, that if an attempt is made to take it from the Speaker's table and pass it by unanimous consent, I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, would feel constrained to object.

I say that the matter of any possible manipulations of the coffee market in this country should be gone into further at this time, especially a matter with such implications for our relationships between the 5 or 6 coffee-growing countries and our own.

Any action in this House with respect to a commodity which is not an actual commodity of this country is going to be taken as an affront by the coffee-growing countries. Actually, the only countries of South and Central America today which are in a substantial position are those countries which are growing coffee.

It boils down to this, in my opinion, with reference to this matter: Either we must permit these countries to maintain their economies charging whatever prices are necessary in their opinion, or we revert to a process of grants-in-aid, as we have done elsewhere throughout the world to bolster unsound economies.

I do feel, however, that the whole matter of coffee both from the very inception from the planting to the harvesting of the coffee, taking into consideration all of the natural difficulties which we know have been experienced in some of the countries, on through the export processes and into the market place should be made a matter of a far more intensive study than has already been accomplished.

Simply to take this one foreign product and say we are going to govern how that is handled in the market place, I believe, has some inherent implications that are very bad.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman realizes, of course, that the amendment to which I referred in no way tells other countries what they shall do; we are not dictating to other countries. It only affects speculation within the United States, and certainly I do not see where that is an affront to any other country. No other nation is involved. We are not trying to project ourselves into other countries and dictate to them. We are trying to regulate and control speculation within the United States; and, certainly, with all due respect to my distinguished friend, his argument is a very fine one which in some aspects I agree with. But in this particular case I do not see its applicability.

Mr. JACKSON. I was simply suggesting that I think the entire matter should be made the subject of a far more detailed study than has been made up to the present time because of the implications which exist. I have been through the countries on a number of occasions and I know every time this subject is mentioned it causes a sort of alarm throughout the hemisphere.

Mr. McCORMACK. A bill passed this House putting onions under this act. Does the gentleman think coffee is as important as onions?

Mr. JACKSON. There are very few countries in the hemisphere which have any particular concern about onions.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are not concerned with other countries. This bill if put into operation covers only speculation in the United States and certainly the coffee producing countries should be pleased to have speculation controlled in the United States because they are incorrectly blamed for it.

Mr. JACKSON. Let us determine to what extent the speculation has taken place. If it has taken place in fact then is the time to move in on it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments to the House amendments Nos. 1 and 3 were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENTS OF CERTAIN MERCHANT-TYPE VESSELS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 3546) to provide an immediate program for the modernization and improvement of such merchant-type vessels in the reserve fleet as are necessary for national defense, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TOLLEFSON, ALLEN of California, RAY, BONNER, and SHELLEY.

AMENDING SECTION 413 (B) OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 9910) to amend section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) A person appointed as a Foreign Service officer of classes 1 through 5, inclusive, shall receive salary at the minimum rate provided for the class to which he has been appointed, except that until March 31, 1955, not more than 500 persons may be appointed at other than the minimum rate."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when a second is demanded, is that Member supposed to be opposed to the bill or can a second be demanded by someone for the bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no idea of what the position of the gentleman from Arkansas is concerning this bill. Opposition to the bill would naturally get preference.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill adjusts salary rates so that a person entering the Foreign Service from the State Department will not have to take a loss in salary. A similar provision, but without the limits placed in this bill, passed the Senate as a rider on an appropriation bill. Our conferees objected, saying, I think properly, that it was a legislative matter. It came to our committee in the middle of July, and this little bill is the result.

If you glance through the report, you will realize that we need to improve and

strengthen our Foreign Service. It has dwindled from 1,427 in 1953 to 1,283 last March.

There are two ways to get into our Foreign Service. One is at the bottom of the 6 classes and the other is through what we call lateral entry or entry into one of the upper 5 classes. Each class has up to eight different pay rates within the class. Each way, whether you go in at the bottom or come in through lateral entry, requires an examination and requires appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman has referred to this as a little bill. Will the gentleman tell the House how much this bill will cost the taxpayers and who it was that reduced the Foreign Service from the figure that he mentioned?

Mr. VORYS. This bill is estimated to cost \$65,000. The reduction in the Foreign Service came from a number of causes. One of them may have been the reduction in appropriations. This bill is the result of the Wriston Committee Report which was released in June. They recommended 1,300 from the civil service and the State Department and 1,300 from the Foreign Service reserve and staff be taken in as Foreign Service officers through lateral entry. Due to the fact that our committee got this report late and have not studied all its phases, we have limited the application of this bill until March 30, 1955, and we provide that not more than 500 lateral entries may be made under this amendment. The estimated cost would be \$65,000. Remember, under this amendment no new people are going on the Government payroll. They are simply transferring from one payroll to another. The present law requires each lateral entrant to go in at the pay rate for the bottom of the class to which he is appointed. There are about eight different pay rates in a class. A survey has shown that if a man from civil service would want to go in laterally, he might have to take a salary loss up to \$1,670 under the present law, with an average loss of \$627, and therefore he will not transfer. This little 21-word amendment would permit the Secretary of State to adjust the salaries so that the loss would not take place. The average of adjustments and additions to make the salaries come out even with civil-service rates would, based on the survey in one section of the State Department, amount to \$130 each, and at that rate the bill would cost \$65,000.

The Wriston report, which is referred to in our report, made a number of recommendations for improvement in the Foreign Service. Many of them can be done administratively; others will require legislation that we expect to take up next year. It is very important, however, to get new blood started going into the Foreign Service soon through lateral entry.

Now, as I say, these lateral entries all have to pass examinations; they must have 4 years' previous service if they are

under 31; 3 years if they are over 31. It is simply this requirement for entering at the bottom pay of the class that is preventing a number of good men from going in. Only 51 have gone in since 1946, and in the past 2 years since 1952 no applicants have been taken into the lowest class. One of the reasons is that from 1946 on the Board of Examiners has probably been too strict. The appointment of the examiners is for the Secretary of State, but this will provide the means for having these people, when they are qualified, not to have to take a loss in salary when they go in.

Mr. ROONEY. I am wondering whether or not this little bill would be the means of the camel getting his nose under the tent, because Assistant Secretary of State Saltzman testified before the Committee on Appropriations some few weeks ago that if we were to follow out the terms of the Wriston report that it would cost the taxpayers in the neighborhood of \$7 million.

Mr. VORYS. The cost of putting into effect all of the provisions of the Wriston report would be about \$7 million. That is all listed in the report on this bill. The only way we can get any estimate of the cost of this particular provision is to estimate it at \$65,000. I do not think the estimated retirement costs can properly be allocated to this bill, because no deduction of the savings in civil-service retirement costs is made.

As to the matter of retirement, some persons have brought up the question that this might be a scheme simply for getting people to go into the foreign service, and then retire. On this point I want to quote from a letter from the Secretary of State, which I received this morning:

The Honorable JOHN M. VORYS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR Mr. VORYS: In my letter to Mr. Chipfield of July 1, 1954, I pointed out the desirability of an amendment to the Foreign Service Act of 1946 which would permit the transfer of officers from the Department, Foreign Service Reserve, and the Foreign Service Staff to the Foreign Service officer corps at any of the salary rates of the Foreign Service officer class to which they are appointed. As you know, I am very anxious to obtain congressional action on this amendment to the Foreign Service Act, designated H. R. 9910, during the present session of Congress so that we may proceed with my program.

Officers appointed under this authority become entitled to the benefits of the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, which in some respects provides more liberal benefits than the civil-service system. In administering this program, the Department will not permit persons to enter the Foreign Service officer corps unless they are young enough to assure that they will spend at least 5 years overseas before retirement.

The Foreign Service Act of 1946 under section 636 provides that an officer who has at least 20 years of service and has reached the age of 50 may on his own application and with the consent of the Secretary be retired. In order to assure that persons transferring into the corps do not obtain unwarranted retirement benefits, applications for voluntary retirement will not be approved unless an officer has completed at least 5 years of service abroad.

The retirement advantages are by no means all on the side of the Foreign Service system. The civil-service retirement system

contains certain advantageous features which officers would lose on transfer to the Foreign Service system. Survivorship annuities, credit for service in the Armed Forces, and maximum service credit for computing annuities are all more favorable under the civil-service system.

It should also be pointed out that persons transferring do not receive credit for prior service upon entering the Foreign Service retirement system unless they make the necessary contributions to the retirement fund, which, in most instances, will involve paying sums in addition to the amount received as a refund from the civil-service retirement fund.

I wish to assure you that the Department is alert to the necessity of taking every precaution providing for equitable administration of the Foreign Service retirement system and preventing its abuse under the program which I have approved.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

I think we can trust our Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, and his able deputy, Under Secretary for Administration, Mr. Saltzman, to do a good job of administering this program to build up the Foreign Service.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, little need be added to what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Vorys) has said.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering whether the Committee on Foreign Affairs went into the question of this retirement system, under which people who are in the Foreign Service may retire and come under their retirement system by paying only 5 percent of their salary whereas civil-service employees pay 6 percent; also, they are permitted the privilege of voluntary retirement, subject to approval at the age of 50, when the others may not retire before 60 and need 30 years of service to get out.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The letter of the Secretary of State refers to that, if I may call the gentleman's attention to it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The letter of the Secretary of State from which I have just read throws some light on that. In the first place, he said this:

In order to assure that persons transferring into the corps do not obtain unwarranted retirements, applications for voluntary retirement will not be approved unless an officer has completed at least 5 years of service abroad.

The retirement advantages are by no means all on the side of the Foreign Service System. The civil-service retirement system contains certain advantageous features which officers would lose on transfer to the Foreign Service System. Survivorship annuities, credit for service in the Armed Forces, and maximum service credit for computing annuities are all more favorable under the Civil Service System.

It should also be pointed out that persons transferring do not receive credit for prior service upon entering the foreign-service retirement system unless they make the necessary contributions to the retirement fund which, in most instances, will involve paying

sums in addition to the amount received as a refund from the civil-service retirement fund.

We made the best estimate we could of it, and we came to the conclusion that there were sufficient benefits on both sides; that in many cases it would be "even Stephen." We came to the conclusion that they cannot get these people to come over if they have got to take an initial substantial cut in salary. That is why we approved this trial heat, from now until next March, for not to exceed 500, toward a program of 2,600, which is recommended. We believe this is a sound and conservative approach.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], the ranking minority member of the committee, called me yesterday to say that he favored this legislation and would be glad for it to be discussed as fully as time permitted. He is absent from the city today. As the gentleman from Ohio indicates, there are some objections to retirement features, but they are balanced by some of the considerations to which the gentleman has just alluded in discussing Secretary Dulles' letter.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was thoroughly and carefully considered by the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and subsequently was approved unanimously by the full committee. This measure is a start in the necessary direction to improve, strengthen, and expand the Foreign Service of the United States to meet the enlarged responsibilities which have been placed on the shoulders of the Service during this post-war period. While the bill deals with only one small phase of the overall problem of the improvement of the Foreign Service, it is nonetheless a very important feature.

The Foreign Service Act of 1946 requires lateral entry for all except class 6, the lowest class, at the minimum rate of salary for any one of the classes from 1 through 5 to which appointment was made, resulting in many cases in a loss in salary for persons transferring into the Foreign Service. The pending bill would remove this inequity by authorizing the Secretary of State for a limited time, namely, until March 31, 1955, and for a limited number of applicants, specifically 500, to make appointments at other than the minimum rate in classes 1 through 5. This will give the recommendation of the Wriston Committee in this regard a trial; if it proves to be workable, which I believe it will, then the time limit can be extended and the number increased.

Mr. Speaker, we have learned through experience in our foreign relations that morale is one of the keys to the success of our efforts. If our allies do not have the morale, then we certainly know that the whole collective security effort stands on a precipice. I believe the same thing can be said about the Foreign Service. The pressures are greater now than ever before. The responsibilities of the Foreign Service are heavier and more complicated than ever before in its history. Surely now, the Congress should do everything which reasonably can be done to bolster the morale of the Foreign

Service of the United States. The bill is a step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to address a few questions to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. The 500 persons designated in this bill are the start toward increasing the number of officers in the Foreign Service to a total of how many, and from what base?

Mr. VORYS. The Wriston committee recommends 3,900. In March it was 1,285. I think they have gotten a few since then. About a year ago it was over 1,400.

Mr. GROSS. So this is a move to more than double the number of officers in the Foreign Service. Is that correct?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. I might say that the Wriston report points out what we all know, that we have a dwindling force for a growing job. Of course, the control of the size of the Foreign Service is going to be through the Appropriations Committee, because they will have to decide whether they can get the money.

Mr. GROSS. I assume that under the program of building more, bigger, and better embassies all over the world it will be necessary to send more people to inhabit them. Most of these people, as I understand it, and the gentleman can correct me if I am wrong, would go from what amounts to grade 14 in the classified service, \$9,610 to \$10,600, to what amounts to grade 15 in the classified service, \$10,800 to \$11,800 a year. Is that correct?

Mr. VORYS. No; that is incorrect. We have charts in the hearings that show the classes into which they would go. For instance, as we point out in our report, it is expected that 420 would transfer into class 6, the lowest class. The largest group I think would go into class 5. There are few expected to go into the upper classes, and only 30 into FSO class 1. On page 7 of our report we give some comparisons between civil service and FSO salaries.

Mr. GROSS. From what grades of the Foreign Service would most of these officers come? Is it not true they come from between 3 and 4?

Mr. VORYS. Some might. They might come from 3 and 4, on up through all the other civil-service grades, but largely from GS-7 on up.

Mr. GROSS. Let us take that argument, then. They could go from 5, which is the lowest grade, up into grade 15 or 16 or in the classified service. Do you provide in this bill that these people who are thus advanced in salary shall be sent into the overseas service? Is there any compulsion on the part of the Department of State after you advance these people in salary that they be sent overseas?

Mr. VORYS. The compulsion is that they have to go if they enter the Service and are ordered to go. There is nothing that would require the State Department to send them. But what is needed by the State Department is to send these people overseas so that we can have more

than 119 Foreign Service officers serving in the State Department, which is the case at present, in order to carry out our re-Americanization program of our Foreign Service officers. If the gentleman will permit me, I will yield him an additional minute because I am trespassing on his time. On one matter that the gentleman brought up, under existing law under the Foreign Service Act of 1946, it is theoretically possible, and it would be legal for the Secretary of State to take a GS class 3 and put him into a Foreign Service class 1 right at the top. That is theoretically possible, but it has never been done.

Mr. GROSS. It is legally possible, is it not?

Mr. VORYS. It is legally possible, but it has never been done during the whole 8 years of experience under this law. On the other hand, they have been fussy about putting a man just into the class opposite him. They have graded them so very closely. In many instances where, if they put a man at the bottom of the next higher class, you would think that that would be all right, yet they insist upon literally lateral entry, considering his qualifications. This has been the experience for 8 years, and I suspect that it is the experience that will continue, although there is the legal possibility the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. In connection with my statement a minute ago that adoption of this bill would be a step which would permit the camel to get its nose under the tent, I want to accentuate that this would be a broad step toward the adoption of the Wriston report. Among other expensive things in that report, there is one statement as follows:

The committee strongly recommends that an allowance should be instituted to assist the Foreign Service personnel on duty in countries where educational facilities are inappropriate by American standards in meeting the abnormal costs of securing a proper education for their minor children. Such an allowance should cover expenses of transporting such children to and from schools in the United States or a country where the educational system matches American criteria.

If we are going to pay for transporting children to Switzerland and the United States back and forth, I think this is something to which plenty of time and consideration should be given. I might be in favor of it, but not without hearing more about it. This kind of legislation should not be brought up in this manner in the closing days of a session. It might turn out to be too expensive.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the observation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and I agree with him.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of recommendations in the Wriston report which were not unanimously received and which are somewhat controversial. For instance, there is a proposal for the Foreign Service scholarship training program. There is the one which the

gentleman just mentioned about the children's educational allowance, which will require additional legislation. Although the other body passed this without any restrictions, we put limitations on it in time and in numbers so as to insure that this program is going to be brought before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs early next year. The present provision is, however, a very small one and it is very simple and easy to understand. It is utterly necessary to have the lateral entry program get a trial heat, or test run, this fall. Therefore, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article by John Cramer in today's Washington Daily News entitled "Here's How To Get a Government Job (With GOP Help)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cramer's highly interesting article reads as follows:

HERE'S HOW TO GET A GOVERNMENT JOB (WITH GOP HELP)

(By John Cramer)

Here is documentary proof of how politics is being played with Government jobs—admittedly on orders of the Eisenhower administration, and obviously with the cooperation of its Civil Service Commission and its agency heads.

The proof is a copy of a mimeographed form letter from the New York State Republican Committee, telling county and local GOP chairmen about Government job vacancies, and inviting their cooperation in filling these vacancies with Republican faithful.

The letter says that the list of job vacancies has been furnished by the Republican National Committee.

It is made up with blanks to be filled in for the particular vacancies and the particular cities where they exist.

It instructs county and local GOP chairmen how to go about getting New York State Republican recommendation for their candidates for these vacancies.

And it closes with this revealing sentence: "As the above procedure has been set up by the present administration to secure more patronage for Republican endorsees, your prompt attention to this matter is requested."

A photographic copy of the New York State committee's letter accompanies this column.

Here are the questions you will want answered:

1. Where and how do the Eisenhower administration's agency heads fit into this attempt to fill Government jobs with Republicans only?

The answer is twofold: First—by reason of the letter's statement that the "procedure has been set up by the present administration." Second—because the one obvious way for the Republican National Committee to obtain lists of job vacancies, and transmit them to the New York State GOP committee, and other State GOP committees, is through administration agency heads.

2. Where does the Civil Service Commission fit in?

The answer is a long and somewhat strange story.

When Civil Service Commission is unable to conduct civil nonpartisan, nonpolitical exams for Government jobs, it grants agencies what it calls "303 recruiting authority"—which is authority to fill the jobs without requiring civil service exams.

This authority ordinarily is widely granted only during emergencies—the Korean emergency, for example. It is mostly used when Government is expanding rapidly, and when the Commission obviously can't conduct exams for all the employees Federal agencies must hire.

Recently, the Commission did a curious thing with its "303 recruiting authority." Without publicity, it notified all its regional offices that whenever such authority was granted, they must immediately notify agency heads in Washington in detail about the particular job vacancies to be filled.

The Commission insists this action had no political purpose. Others disagree. They say it was done so that agency heads could know all jobs being filled without civil service exam, and could then notify the GOP National Committee.

The Commission's official explanation of its action says:

"A few months ago the Commission made a sample check of recruiting authorities issued in several areas. The number of these authorities was so large that it raised questions as to the effectiveness of the Commission's examining program in the field. The Commission decided the matter should have more study on a national basis. Also the Commission wished to bring to the attention of the heads of agencies in Washington the hiring practices of their installations in the field. Agency heads are in a position to give added impetus to the overall examining program through boards of examiners in their agencies. Therefore, the Commission instructed its regional offices several weeks ago that one copy of each recruiting authority issued by a regional office or by a board of examiners in a field installation should be sent to the head of the appropriate agency in Washington."

It should be noted here that the Commission's explanation points out that agency heads have the power to give "added impetus" to civil service exam programs conducted by agency boards of examiners.

What the Commission did not say is that these same agency heads also have power to slow down and delay the boards of examiners programs thereby making still more jobs available to political faithfuls.

The Commission points out that Army Department, a major Government employer, recently issued orders for the strengthening of its boards of examiners program.

There are well-founded reports, however, that other agencies have issued slow-down orders.

You will form your own opinion as to whether the Commission's order, directing that all agency heads be notified of "303" job vacancies, was political or nonpolitical.

This much, however, is clear.

Political use is being made of the order.

The New York State Republican Committee's letter is proof.

[Dean P. Taylor, chairman; Jane Todd, vice chairman; Alger B. Chapman, treasurer; Walter E. Bligh, secretary—Mrs. Charles W. Weis, Jr., Dean P. Taylor, members, Republican National Committee]

NEW YORK

REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE,

New York, N. Y.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: The Republican National Committee has advised this office that the following vacancy exists within the----- in the city of----- for a-----

Your candidate for this position should apply to the personnel officer at the Bureau of-----, with a completed Form 57, which may be picked up at any

post office. Your committee should, in turn, forward to this office an additional Form 57, so that I may submit same to national committee with the State committee's recommendation.

The authority to fill the above listed position is granted to the above agency by the Civil Service Commission, and no civil service status is required of the applicant. This temporary authority expires-----

----- Requirements attached.

----- Requirements will be forwarded.

----- Requirements for this position will be given by the bureau personnel officer.

As the above procedure has been set up by the present administration in an attempt to secure more patronage for Republican endorsees, your prompt attention to this matter is requested.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. MacKENZIE,

Assistant to the Chairman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 54, noes 20.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the agreement between the leadership on both sides, I wonder whether instead of objecting to the vote at this time on the ground that a quorum is not present we could not postpone proceedings in connection with this matter until tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the vote on this measure will be suspended until tomorrow.

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may extend their remarks during the consideration under suspension of H. R. 9910.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly concerning H. R. 9910, a bill to amend section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. For some time I have been extremely interested in the many studies and surveys which have been made of the organization of the Foreign Service, particularly in those studies and surveys which have grappled with the tremendous problems involved in improving the personnel system of the Foreign Service and in bringing about a closer integration between that Service and the civil service employees of the Department of State and other principal governmental agencies with foreign affairs' responsibilities.

I have a strong interest in this subject and also some responsibility in this area as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations of the Committee on Government Operations. Our subcommittee, I might note, held hearings in the first session of the 83d Congress on certain aspects of the Department of State's administration of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, with particular regard for economy and efficiency. During this session we received testimony concerning the comprehensive survey of overseas policies and practices being conducted under the direction of Mr. Philip Young in his capacity as personnel adviser to the President. In addition, the subcommittee has reviewed the many reports dealing with this subject

submitted by various commissions and other study groups over the years, including the current report prepared by the Public Committee on Personnel headed by Dr. Henry M. Wriston, which reported to the Secretary of State in May of this year on measures to increase the effectiveness of the Foreign Service.

I want to make it clear, however, that while the Subcommittee on International Operations expects to continue its work in this field my remarks today are personal ones and do not necessarily reflect the thinking of the other members of the subcommittee.

In general, I am definitely in favor of this bill. I am prepared to vote for it and wish to go on record as supporting this move. In considering its merits, however, I would like, in the interest of caution, to make a few qualifying remarks.

One of the purposes of this bill, as you all know, is to encourage the lateral entry into the Foreign Service Officer Corps of personnel who have served not less than 3 years in the Department of State as civil-service employees or have served as Foreign Service reserve or Foreign Service staff employees. I understand that the latter two categories would include qualified overseas personnel from other agencies, such as the Foreign Operations Administration and the United States Information Agency.

The employees of these agencies employed in the United States, however, are not eligible for entry into the Foreign Service under the new liberalized entrance policy. This is a matter on which I believe the International Operations Subcommittee will make recommendations on at a later date. It should be noted also that a number of employees now in these agencies were formerly in the Department of State. Their eligibility for transfer into the Foreign Service was terminated in effect by Reorganization Plans 7 and 8, setting up the FOA and the USIA.

This bill would offer in effect a greater financial inducement to prospective employees qualified to enter the Foreign Service Officer Corps on a lateral entry basis. The Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, in section 413 (b) provides that a person appointed as a Foreign Service officer of classes 1 through 5 inclusive shall receive a salary at the minimum rate for the class to which he has been appointed. H. R. 9910 would amend section 413 (b) to permit the Secretary of State until March 31, 1955, to appoint not more than 500 persons at higher than the minimum rate. In brief, the Secretary, having decided what class a successful lateral entry candidate is suited for would have the authority to authorize a salary at one of the in-grade rates within that class.

We cannot entirely ignore the possibility, however, that unfortunate situations might arise if the discretion of the Secretary to select the class is abused. In reading the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on this bill I note on page 7 where illustrative cases are set out, that almost invariably persons applying for lateral entry would be considered for FSO classes carrying base salaries considerably below their

present salaries. While the purpose of this bill would remedy the financial aspect of the problem, I hope that the Secretary of State will not be governed entirely in making appointments by comparative salaries but will also give due consideration to insuring that the employee receives a Foreign Service officer class grade compatible with his experience and ability. The Foreign Service Officer Corps is an elite career service, and I think properly so. A man's class in the Officer Corps is a matter of distinction and pride, and I hope that if this bill is passed precaution will be taken to insure that successful lateral entries are given appropriate class designations, if deserved, rather than high in-grade positions in a lower class.

The second matter which I feel is of the utmost importance in considering this bill is that it must be viewed against the whole background of the work that is being done to reorganize and improve the Foreign Service. While to my knowledge this is the only piece of legislation which has been suggested for passage by the Department of State as a result of the findings of the Wriston committee, it should not be regarded as an adequate legislative response to the problems which beset the Foreign Service as presently organized and operated. The passage of this bill may assist in providing new blood for the Foreign Service Officer Corps. However, it is only one part of what must be done to insure that the Foreign Service will be able to operate effectively here and abroad in the best interests of the United States. I feel that the Congress has a great responsibility to bring about needed changes in the present system of organization, and I hope that much can be accomplished during the first session of the 84th Congress. The Subcommittee on International Operations is looking into the problems of organization involved and I expect that it will make practical and useful recommendations to the House.

Making note of these limited observations, I again indicate my support for H. R. 9910 and urge its adoption.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my interest in the Foreign Service and its problems has been of long standing. Ever since my membership in the House I have given close attention to the Foreign Service. But I also have a personal interest in its success. My brother was an officer in that body for 12 years.

I can well recall the intensive consideration given the Service by our committee and the Congress in 1946. All of us were impressed by the demands made upon it in the postwar period and all of us were anxious to assure that it attracted and retained the services of only the most qualified individuals. We hoped, by the 1946 act, to strengthen and expand the officer corps by providing sufficient incentives to those who were selected for it.

Unfortunately the high hopes we had have not been achieved. Successive analyses over the past 8 years indicate no expansion commensurate with the needs of the Service. Within the past 2

years there has been an actual decline in numbers. Administrative deficiencies by the Department as well as limitations in the law explain in large measure the shortfall in accomplishments. The Department is addressing itself to improved administration. In this bill the Congress is doing its part to improve the law.

One of the features written into the 1946 act permitted individuals to enter the Foreign Service at other than the lowest class. The reason was that we needed men of some maturity and experience to handle the pressing problems with which our missions abroad had to deal. This method of entrance is referred to as lateral entry. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY] has stated, it has not worked. And one reason it has not worked is that the law requires that these lateral entries enter a class, not at one of the in-grade salary steps, but at the bottom salary step. For some individuals this would mean a sizable salary reduction.

This bill has only one purpose—to allow a man to come in at a salary grade approximating that that he now holds. We have written into the bill a limitation of 500 such entries by the end of next March. This will give the committee and the Congress a chance to review the whole situation more thoroughly when the new Congress assembles next year.

I have every reason to feel that this bill will improve the quality of the Foreign Service. I want to do nothing to injure this Service which I believe is vital to our national defense. The Secretary of State is anxious to improve the operation of his Department. It is his opinion that this bill will go a long way to accomplish that purpose. Because I share his view I am supporting this bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a particular interest in this bill. Along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY] and the late Judge Kee, I helped draft the Foreign Service Act of 1946. I was—and am—proud of that act. It included a number of provisions that we felt would strengthen and expand the Foreign Service.

When we passed that act, we thought the Department of State would use all the provisions to discharge its heavy responsibilities. We were particularly anxious that the Department be permitted to increase its Foreign Service officer numbers in the middle and upper classes of the Service because our posts abroad needed men with experience. One feature of the law of which I am particularly proud is the one popularly referred to as the re-Americanization section. We did not want to set up a service where long tours of duty abroad would remove our officers from the changing currents in American thinking. We hoped that there would be more frequent assignment of Foreign Service officers to the United States.

The recent testimony before our committee surprised a number of us. More than half of our Foreign Service men have had less than 1 year of duty in the United States and about three-quarters have had less than 3 years. The explanation given was that the Service was so shorthanded abroad that the law could not be carried out.

If the Congress passes this bill, one result will be that more positions in the Department will be available to the Foreign Service. And I want to make clear at this point that this bill does not increase the number of jobs in the Government. It merely transfers some from the civil service system to the Foreign Service system.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORHS] has discussed other features of this bill. I agree with his statements. All we want to do is make it possible for the Secretary of State to use the personnel under his jurisdiction to the maximum advantage. He thinks this bill will help him in that purpose and I agree with him. For that reason I am supporting this bill.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during my experience as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I have had the opportunity to come in contact with many officials of our State Department, and with members of our Foreign Service. Being deeply interested in an effective and efficient execution of our foreign policy, I could not help becoming concerned about the personnel problems of the Department of State.

Many authorities have testified as to the need for some overall changes in the personnel system of the Department. Under current conditions, there is poor utilization of manpower resources, and poor morale within the Department and within the Foreign Service. These factors hamper and detract from the proper execution of our foreign policy.

The bill which is before us is intended to alleviate this deplorable situation to a small extent. It would adjust salary rates so that persons entering the Foreign Service from the State Department will not have to take a loss in salary. I believe that this proposal, based on the recommendations of the Wriston committee, is meritorious and constructive. It ought to receive our full support.

It is my earnest hope that the passage of this bill will be but the initial step in the new series of constructive improvements which will give our Nation and our Government the best possible representation abroad. The Wriston committee has made a number of other recommendations which may require, and ought to receive, congressional approval. Early progress in this respect will benefit our entire Nation.

I should like to mention at this point that while I support the bill before us and favor many of the other recommendations of the Wriston committee, I feel that they fall short of the objectives which we should strive to attain. It has been my conviction that a Foreign Service Academy ought to be established by Congress in order to provide our Government with an adequate reservoir of able, especially trained, young men and women for overseas assignments. I had introduced bills in the 82d and 83d Congresses which provide for the establishment of such an academy, and I hope that this legislation will eventually receive favorable consideration from this body.

The execution of our foreign policy will always depend to a great extent on the caliber and morale of our Foreign

Service personnel. We should strive, therefore, to assure that our Nation have the best possible representation abroad.

The approval of the bill before us will be a step in the right direction.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I support H. R. 9910 and urge its passage. The increased responsibilities thrust upon the United States in world affairs make it imperative that constant attention be given to our Foreign Service. We cannot expect our Government to discharge its obligations abroad if that body of Government servants is not operating at maximum efficiency.

In the last 30 years Congress has been concerned about the defects in the Foreign Service. As recently as 1946 the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported out a measure for the complete reorganization of the Foreign Service. That bill was enacted into law and is the cornerstone of the service today. As the committee noted in its report, the bill—and now the law—is based upon a few fundamental principles.

First. The concept of a professional service should remain paramount.

Second. A disciplined and mobile corps of trained men should be maintained through entry at the bottom on the basis of competitive examination and advancement by merit to positions of command.

Third. Political influence should be excluded, while loyalty and esprit de corps should be sustained at a high level as essential elements in the efficient operation of the service.

Fourth. Compensation should be sufficient to attract able men regardless of the possession of private means.

In 1940 the Foreign Service had 826 officers. When the 1946 act was passed, the Service had 820—a reduction at the very time that we needed more people in the Foreign Service. Recruiting had been suspended during the war, thus interrupting the orderly entrance of individuals who could work their way to the higher positions. The only way to meet the need for additional strength in the middle and upper classes and still retain the principles of a career service not susceptible to political influence was to encourage the transfer of individuals from the State Department to the Foreign Service.

The 1946 act contains a provision for so-called lateral entry that permits their transfer to the Foreign Service from the State Department. Under this provision a State Department officer in the higher civil service classes could enter the Foreign Service at other than the lowest class after passing written, oral, physical and other examinations that would determine his fitness and aptitude for the Foreign Service. His age, qualifications and experience would determine the Foreign Service class he would enter. In any case he would receive the lowest salary for that particular class.

Contrary to the fears of many that there would be an unprecedented rush to join the Foreign Service through lateral entry, between 1946 and the spring of 1954—this past spring—only 51 entered. The Under Secretary for

Administration, Charles E. Saltzman, told our committee that one obstacle was the requirement of entry only at the lowest salary level. For many individuals this would mean a salary cut—in some cases as much as \$1,620.

The bill now before the House does only one thing—it permits lateral entry at a salary other than the lowest of the class. All the other requirements that are presently in the law remain. The Department is still engaged in analyzing what this amendment may mean to individuals in various civil-service classes. In response to the committee's request, it ran a sample of one bureau and told us that the estimated additional cost of the Government in salary would be about \$130 for each person transferred.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that if this amendment is adopted, it will help strengthen the Foreign Service. But I am under no illusion that this amendment is all that is needed. Many of the problems of the Foreign Service stem from poor administration of the law. Until the Department itself undertakes to improve its administration there is little need for congressional action.

I think my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee recognize that poor administration lies at the root of the problems both of the Foreign Service and of the Department. One way that we can find out how matters are going is to require the Department to come back early next year to explain the operations of the law.

That is the reason we have put in a limitation as to the number that can be admitted—500—by the end of next March. And let me emphasize here that this is not an increase of 500 on the government payroll. This amendment permits as many as that number to transfer from the civil-service system to the Foreign Service System. By rotating more people between the field and Washington it will enlarge the experience of more individuals and place at the disposal of the Secretary of State a larger reservoir of trained personnel.

By next spring we will know whether the Department's explanation is valid that the salary differential has been a real barrier to lateral entry. Then the Foreign Affairs Committee can examine more carefully the whole range of problems confronting our Foreign Service.

I have always favored as strong a Foreign Service as our Government can obtain. It is not a matter of party or of politics—it is just plain commonsense.

GROUP LIFE INSURANCE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3681) to authorize the Civil Service Commission to make available group life insurance for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954."

Sec. 2. (a) Except as provided in (b) of this section, each appointive or elective officer or employee (hereinafter called employee) in or under the executive, judicial,

or legislative branch of the United States Government, including a Government-owned or controlled corporation (but not including any corporation under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, of which corporation any member of the board of directors is elected or appointed by private interests), and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia shall, at such time and under such conditions of eligibility as the Civil Service Commission (hereinafter called the Commission) may by regulation prescribe, come within the purview of this act. Such regulations may provide for the exclusion of employees on the basis of the nature and type of employment or conditions pertaining thereto such as, but not limited to, short-term appointments, seasonal or intermittent employment, part-time employment, and employment of like nature, and shall be issued only after consultation with the head of the department, establishment, agency, or other employing authority concerned: *Provided*, That no employee or group of employees shall be excluded solely on the basis of the hazardous nature of employment.

(b) This act shall not apply to noncitizen employees whose permanent-duty station is located outside a State of the United States or the District of Columbia, nor shall it apply to commissioned officers and enlisted personnel on active duty in or with the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, who have indemnity coverage under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 33).

Sec. 3. (a) Each employee to whom this act applies shall be eligible to be insured for an amount of group life insurance approximating his annual compensation not exceeding \$20,000 plus an equal amount of group accidental death and dismemberment insurance, in accordance with the following schedule:

If annual compensation is—		The amount of group life insurance shall be—	The amount of group accidental death and dismemberment insurance shall be—
Greater than	But not greater than		
0	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
\$1,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
3,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
4,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
5,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
6,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
7,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
8,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
9,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
10,000	11,000	11,000	11,000
11,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
12,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
13,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
14,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
15,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
16,000	17,000	17,000	17,000
17,000	18,000	18,000	18,000
18,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
19,000	-----	20,000	20,000

(b) Subject to the conditions and limitations of the policy or policies purchased by the Commission under this act, as may be approved by the Commission, the group accidental death and dismemberment insurance shall provide payments as follows:

Loss	Amount payable
For loss of life.	Full amount shown in the schedule in (a) of this section.
Loss of one hand or one foot or loss of sight of one eye.	One-half the amount shown in the schedule in (a) of this section.
Loss of two or more such members.	Full amount shown in the schedule in (a) of this section.

For any one accident the aggregate amount of group accidental death and dismember-

ment insurance that may be paid shall not exceed the amount shown in the schedule in (a) of this section.

(c) The Commission shall by regulation provide for the conversion of other than annual rates of compensation to an annual basis, and shall further specify the types of compensation to be included in annual compensation.

(d) Each of such amounts of insurance shall be reduced by 2 percent thereof at the end of each full calendar month following the date the employee attains age 65, subject to minimum amounts prescribed by the Commission, but not less than 25 percent of the insurance in force immediately preceding the first reduction provided herein: *Provided*, That the amounts of insurance in force from time to time on an employee who becomes insured under this act after having attained the age of 65 shall be the same as would be in force had he been insured at age 65, and shall be based on the lesser of his annual compensation (1) at the time he becomes so insured, or (2) at age 65, provided he was eligible at that time to be insured under this act.

Sec. 4. Any amount of group life insurance and group accidental death insurance in force on any employee at the date of his death shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, to the person or persons surviving at the date of his death, in the following order of precedence:

First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries as the employee may have designated by a writing received in the employing office prior to death;

Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow or widower of such employee;

Third, if none of the above, to the child or children of such employee and descendants of deceased children by representation;

Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of such employee or the survivor of them;

Fifth, if none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such employee;

Sixth, if none of the above, to other next of kin of such employee entitled under the laws of domicile of such employee at the time of his death.

If any person otherwise entitled to payment under this section does not make claim therefor within 1 year after the death of the employee, or if payment to such person within that period is prohibited by Federal statute or regulation, payment may be made in the order of precedence as if such person had predeceased the employee, and any such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

Sec. 5. (a) During any period in which an employee under age 65 is insured under a policy of insurance purchased by the Commission as authorized in section 7 of this act, there shall be withheld from each salary payment of such employee, as his share of the cost of his group life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance, an amount determined by the Commission, but not to exceed the rate of 25 cents biweekly for each \$1,000 of his group life insurance: *Provided*, That an employee who is paid on other than a biweekly basis shall have an amount so withheld, determined at a proportionate rate, which rate shall be adjusted to the nearest cent.

Any policy of insurance purchased by the Commission as authorized in section 7 of this act shall provide that all employees eligible under the terms of this act will be automatically insured thereunder commencing on the date they first become so eligible: *Provided*, That any employee desiring not to be so insured shall, on an appropriate form to be prescribed by the Commission, give written notice to his employing office that he desires not to be insured. If such notice is received before the employee shall have become insured under such policy, he shall not be so insured; if it is received after he

shall have become insured, his insurance under the policy will cease, effective with the end of the pay period during which the notice is received by the employing office.

(b) For each period in which an employee is insured under a policy of insurance purchased by the Commission as authorized in section 7 of this act, there shall be contributed from the respective appropriation or fund which is used for payment of his salary, wage, or other compensation (or, in the case of an elected official, from such appropriation or fund as may be available for payment of other salaries of the same office or establishment) a sum computed at a rate determined by the Commission, but not to exceed one-half the amount withheld from the employee under this section.

(c) The sums withheld from employees under subsection (a) and the sums contributed from appropriations and funds under subsection (b) shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of a fund which is hereby created. Said fund is hereby made available without fiscal year limitation for premium payments under any insurance policy or policies purchased as authorized in sections 7 and 10 of this act, and for any expenses incurred by the Commission in the administration of this act within such limitations as may be specified annually in appropriation acts: *Provided*, That appropriations available to the Commission for salaries and expenses for the fiscal year 1955 shall be available on a reimbursable basis for necessary administrative expenses of carrying out the purposes of this act until said fund shall be sufficient to provide therefor. The income derived from any dividends or premium rate adjustments received from insurers shall constitute a part of said fund.

Sec. 6. Each policy purchased under this act shall contain a provision, in terms approved by the Commission, to the effect that any insurance thereunder on any employee shall cease upon his separation from the service or 12 months after discontinuance of his salary payments, whichever first occurs, subject to a provision which shall be contained in the policy for temporary extension of coverage and for conversion to an individual policy of life insurance under conditions approved by the Commission, except that if upon such date as the insurance would otherwise cease the employee (a) retires on an immediate annuity, and (b) unless retired for disability, has had 15 years of creditable civilian service, as determined by the Commission, his life insurance only may, under conditions determined by the Commission, be continued without cost to him in the amounts for which he would have been insured from time to time had his salary payments continued at the same rate as on the date of cessation.

Sec. 7. (a) The Commission is authorized, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes as amended, to purchase from one or more life insurance companies, as determined by it, a policy or policies of group life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance to provide the benefits specified in this act: *Provided*, That any such company must meet the following requirements: (1) Be licensed under the laws of 48 of the States of the United States and the District of Columbia to transact life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance, and (2) the amount of its employee group life insurance on the most recent December 31 for which information is available to the Commission shall on the date equal at least 1 percent of the total amount of employee group life insurance in the United States in all life insurance companies.

(b) The life insurance company or companies issuing such policy or policies shall establish an administrative office under a name to be approved by the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall arrange with the life insurance company or companies is-

suing any policy or policies purchased under this act to reinsure, under conditions approved by it, portions of the total amount of insurance under the policy or policies, determined as provided in subsection (d) of this section, with such other life insurance companies as may elect to participate in such reinsurance.

(d) The Commission shall determine a formula so that the amount of insurance in force to be retained by each issuing company after ceding reinsurance and the total amount of reinsurance ceded to each reinsuring company shall be in proportion to the total amount of each such company's group life insurance in force in the United States on December 31, 1953: *Provided*, That in determining such proportions, that portion of any company's group life insurance in force on December 31, 1953, which is in excess of \$100,000,000 shall be reduced by 25 percent of the first \$100,000,000 of such excess, 50 percent of the second \$100,000,000 of such excess, 75 percent of the third \$100,000,000 of such excess, and 95 percent of any excess thereafter: *Provided further*, That the amount retained by or ceded to any company shall not exceed 25 percent of the amount of that company's total life insurance in force in the United States on December 31, 1953: *Provided further*, That if, at the end of 1 year following the date of enactment of this act, in the case of any issuing company or reinsurer which insured employees of the Federal Government on December 31, 1953, under policies issued to an association of Federal employees, the amount which results from the application of this formula is less than the decrease, if any, in the amount of such company's insurance under such policies, the amount allocated to such company shall, upon the first reallocation as provided in subsection (e) of this section, be increased to the amount of such decrease: *And provided further*, That any fraternal benefit association which is licensed under the laws of a State of the United States or the District of Columbia to transact life insurance and is engaged in issuing insurance certificates on the lives of employees of the Federal Government exclusively shall be eligible to act as a reinsuring company and may be allocated an amount of reinsurance equal to 25 percent of its total life insurance in force on employees of the Federal Government on December 31, 1953.

(e) The companies eligible to participate as reinsurers, and the amount of insurance under the policy or policies to be allocated to each issuing company or reinsurer may be redetermined by the Commission for and in advance of any policy year after the first, on a basis consistent with subsections (c) and (d) of this section, with any modifications thereof it deems appropriate to carry out the intent of such subsections, and based on each participating company's group life insurance in force, excluding that under any policy or policies purchased under this act except in the case of companies covered in the third proviso of subsection (d), in the United States on the most recent December 31 for which information is available to it, and shall be so redetermined in a similar manner not less often than every 3 years or at any time that any participating company withdraws from participation.

(f) The Commission may at any time discontinue any policy or policies it has purchased from any insurance company.

Sec. 8. (a) Each policy or policies purchased under this act shall include, for the first policy year, basic tables of premium rates as follows:

(1) For group life insurance, a schedule of basic premium rates by age which the Commission shall have determined on a basis consistent with the lowest schedule of basic premium rates generally charged for new group life insurance policies issued to large employers, this schedule of basic premium

rates by age to be applied, except as otherwise provided in this section, to the distribution by age of the amounts of group life insurance under the policy at its date of issue to determine an average basic premium rate per \$1,000 of life insurance, and

(2) For group accidental death and dismemberment insurance, a basic premium rate which the Commission shall have determined on a basis consistent with the lowest rate generally charged for new group accidental death and dismemberment insurance policies issued to large employers.

Each policy so purchased shall also include provisions whereby the basic rates of premium determined for the first policy year shall be continued for subsequent policy years, except that they may be readjusted for any subsequent year, based on the experience under the policy, such readjustment to be made by the insurance company or companies issuing the policy on a basis determined by the Commission in advance of such year to be consistent with the general practice of life insurance companies under policies of group life and group accidental death and dismemberment insurance issued to large employers.

(b) Each policy so purchased shall include a provision that, in the event the Commission determines that ascertaining the actual age distribution of the amounts of group life insurance in force at the date of issue of the policy or at the end of the first or any subsequent year of insurance thereunder would not be possible except at a disproportionately high expense, it may approve the determination of a tentative average group life premium rate, for the first or any subsequent policy year, in lieu of using the actual age distribution. Such tentative average premium rate shall be redetermined by the Commission during any policy year upon request by the insurance company or companies issuing the policy, if experience indicates that the assumptions made in determining the tentative average premium rate for that policy year were incorrect.

(c) Each policy so purchased shall contain a provision stipulating the maximum expense and risk charges for the first policy year, which charges shall have been determined by the Commission on a basis consistent with the general level of such charges made by life insurance companies under policies of group life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance issued to large employers. Such maximum charges shall be continued from year to year, except that the Commission may redetermine such maximum charges for any year either by agreement with the insurance company or companies issuing the policy or upon written notice given by it to such companies at least 1 year in advance of the beginning of the year for which such redetermined maximum charges will be effective.

(d) Each such policy shall provide for an accounting to the Commission not later than 90 days after the end of each policy year, which shall set forth, in a form approved by the Commission, (1) the amounts of premiums actually accrued under the policy from its date of issue to the end of such policy year, (2) the total of all mortality and other claim charges incurred for that period, and (3) the amounts of the insurers' expense and risk charges for that period. Any excess of the total of item (1) over the sum of items (2) and (3) shall be held by the insurance company or companies issuing the policy as a special contingency reserve to be used by such insurance company or companies for charges under such policy only, such reserve to bear interest at a rate to be determined in advance of each policy year by the insurance company or companies issuing the policy, which rate shall be approved by the Commission as being consistent with the rates generally used by such company or companies for similar funds

held under other group life insurance policies: *Provided*, That, if and when the Commission determines that such special contingency reserve has attained an amount estimated by it to make satisfactory provision for adverse fluctuations in future charges under the policy, any further such excess shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the fund. If and when such policy is discontinued, and if after all charges have been made, there is any positive balance remaining in such special contingency reserve, such balance shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the fund, subject to the right of the insurance company or companies issuing the policy to make such deposit in equal monthly installments over a period of not more than 2 years.

Sec. 9. The Commission shall arrange to have each employee insured under such policy receive a certificate setting forth the benefits to which the employee is entitled thereunder, to whom such benefits shall be payable, to whom claims should be submitted, and summarizing the provisions of the policy principally affecting the employee. Such certificate shall be in lieu of the certificate which the insurance company or companies would otherwise be required to issue.

Sec. 10. (a) The Commission is authorized to arrange with any nonprofit association of Federal employees for the assumption by the fund of any existing life insurance agreements of such association with its members retired or otherwise separated from the Federal service and to insure the obligations assumed with any company or companies meeting the requirements of section 7 (a).

(b) Any such arrangement shall provide that payments by such insured members for life insurance only shall thereafter be made at the same rates to the fund, under such conditions as the Commission may prescribe.

(c) Any such arrangement shall further provide that there be transferred to and deposited in the fund the lesser of the following amounts:

(1) The total assets of the life insurance fund of such association; or

(2) The amount required to meet the liabilities under life insurance agreements assumed, taking into account the payments as provided in paragraph (b). The determination of this amount shall be based on an actuarial valuation satisfactory to the Commission, procured by the association without expense to the Commission.

(d) The arrangements authorized by this section shall be made only with those associations which terminate life-insurance agreements with all of their members within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, and such arrangements shall apply only to life insurance granted to any member by any such association before January 1, 1954.

(e) In any case in which the fund assumes a liability for life insurance as provided in this section in respect to a person who (1) subsequently becomes eligible to be insured as an employee under this act, and (2) does not give notice, as provided in section 5 (a), of his desire not to be so insured, the life insurance provided under this section shall terminate as of the date such person becomes insured as an employee.

Sec. 11. Except as otherwise provided herein, the Commission is hereby authorized to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and proper to give effect to the intent, purposes, and provisions of this act.

Sec. 12. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Group Insurance consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury as Chairman, the Secretary of Labor, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who shall serve without additional compensation. The Council shall meet once a year, or oftener at the call of the Commission, and shall review the operations of this act and

advise the Commission on matters of policy relating to its activities thereunder.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall appoint a committee composed of five employees insured under this act, who shall serve without compensation, to advise the Commission regarding matters of concern to employees under this act.

SEC. 13. The Commission shall report annually to Congress upon the operation of this act.

SEC. 14. The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, concurrent with the Court of Claims, of any civil action or claim against the United States founded upon this act.

SEC. 15. The insurance provided by this act and the withholdings and contributions for that purpose shall become effective when directed by the Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does any Member on the minority demand a second?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not know anything about the bill, but I will demand a second to facilitate matters.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. I am not.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin opposed to the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is ordered.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill, S. 3681, which was passed out of a Senate committee unanimously and by the Senate unanimously, came to this body and has been reported from the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with only 2 or 3 minor objections.

The bill is a matter of vital importance to 2,300,000 employees of the Federal Government. It was the subject of nearly 2 years study by a group of Federal executives including Hon. Marion B. Folsom, Under Secretary of the Treasury, and the Civil Service Commission, headed by Hon. Philip Young, Chairman.

This legislation will provide low-cost group life insurance to Federal employees in sums approximately their annual salary.

It authorizes a group-insurance program covering nearly all the civilian employees of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the United States Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

The Civil Service Commission may, by regulations and after consultation with agency heads, exclude persons whose coverage would be administratively impracticable, such as seasonal employees in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, as well as employees hired for a special job, such as employees in the postal service during the Christmas rush.

Each eligible employee would be automatically covered unless he elects to the contrary.

Our committee in its report has emphasized that department and agency heads should point out to all present employees and new employees that this is term insurance as distinguished from ordinary life insurance.

Each covered employee would be insured for a sum equal to his annual compensation raised to the next higher multiple of \$1,000, with a maximum of \$20,000 in any case. Double indemnity and dismemberment insurance also attaches. The amount of insurance would be reduced by 2 percent a month after the individual attains age 65, subject to a maximum reduction of 75 percent. As his share of premium cost for all three types of insurance, there will be withheld from the employee's salary an amount not exceeding 25 cents biweekly for each \$1,000 of life insurance. The Government will contribute an amount not exceeding one-half the sum withheld from the employee. Payment of premiums would end at age 65, or earlier if the employee retires for disability or retires for other reason after at least 15 years' civilian service. Otherwise, separation from service would terminate the insurance, subject to a right of the employee to convert the insurance to an individual policy of life insurance under conditions approved by the Commission.

This is one of the important new proposals which provide necessary elements of a well-rounded personnel program for the Federal service, and that it carries out the plan outlined by the President in his message to the Congress of May 19, 1954.

Recognizing the special problems which exist because of the nature of the Federal service, the bill would adapt to the use of Government an administrative practice which has proved its value in progressive private business. Business has found that group insurance evidences the desire of management to help the employee in increasing his morale and work productivity. Government will derive the same advantages from the plan that are so widely acknowledged in the business world.

It is estimated that the total cost of this program will approximate \$70 million a year, and that the Government's one-third share will be about \$22,750,000. This will be the entire Government expenditure, with no additional appropriation for administrative expenses being necessary. The committee is assured and believes that total administrative cost will not exceed 2 percent of the total premium collected from the Government and from the employees.

This group-insurance program was originally proposed by the President in a special message to Congress. I repeat, it has the unanimous endorsement of the Senate committee and of the Senate, and there were only three votes against it in our committee and that was only because they wanted more opportunity to study it.

We should pass this bill now because of the tremendous interest in this program, because it has been approved by the Senate, because it has the favorable endorsement of the administration, and

because of this startling fact, which should be of vital interest to the Members, namely: That upward of 1,000 Federal employees die every month. Their families and dependents are being deprived of this protection which they would get in private employment. That is not just.

I believe also that it goes without saying that this will be a beneficial program for the Government as well as the employees. It would be one more item tending to keep our employees satisfied and thereby reduce the cost of recruitment and training programs. Likewise the following items should be stressed:

First. Group life insurance is an essential part of a well-rounded personnel program, designed to give the Federal service the employee appeal it must have to attract and hold highly qualified workers.

Second. Provision of this benefit will increase the employee's sense of family security and thereby contribute to better morale and increased productivity.

Third. It will be a deterrent to wasteful turnover, because it provides the inducement of continued participation in the plan with continued service.

Fourth. It will supplement the present benefits of the Employee Compensation Act and the various Government retirement systems.

Fifth. It will provide a means whereby disabled veterans and other physically handicapped persons now working for the Government, or entering Government service in the future, can obtain insurance they might otherwise not be able to get.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I support this measure and am very pleased to see it before us. I don't believe anyone can disagree with the proposition that the men and women who are making their careers in the service of the Federal Government should be on an equal footing with people in private industry when it comes to employment benefits, such as retirement, health protection, and insurance advantages. In almost all of these areas, we have seen to it that there is no discrimination against the Federal worker. But this bill pertains to something that has so far been neglected. Group life insurance plans, available only to numerous persons such as an office or factory or industry group, have never been available to Federal employees.

My confidence and assurance regarding this bill is enhanced by the fact that it is very largely the work of a distinguished citizen of the city of Rochester in my district, now in Washington on leave from the Eastman Kodak Co., to serve as Under Secretary of the Treasury. The Honorable Marion B. Folsom has been studying this problem, and talking about it and recommending action by us for quite some time. It is he who has worked out the problems raised by such a proposal. And I am proud to make this acknowledgment to him as we consider the bill.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Could the gentleman inform us if this coverage is by private insurance companies?

Mr. CORBETT. Without exception. A formula is set up by which companies can qualify, and as to how the purchases will be prorated among companies so that none will have too large a risk or too great a share of the business. That is all included in the bill. In other words, this is not an insurance program which will be underwritten by the Federal Government but is one which will be underwritten by recognized private insurance companies.

Mr. ADAIR. And will work through a number of privately owned and established insurance companies.

Mr. CORBETT. That is entirely correct.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman has mentioned the fact that upon retirement this insurance may be converted. I wonder if the gentleman would tell the House what the situation would be in the case of an employee who has had this insurance for 15 years and then for one reason or other leaves the Government service?

Mr. CORBETT. When an employee is separated from the service he loses the advantage of belonging to the group; hence is no longer covered. But he can convert it to ordinary regular life insurance and without a physical examination but at regular rates for an individual.

Mr. BATES. We understand, then, that an employee after 15 years service who has been under this plan can convert to ordinary insurance?

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman is correct. I might make the general statement that anyone who has once been blanketed under the provisions of this act would be deprived of no proper benefits which were owing to him.

Mr. BATES. I am glad the gentleman said that, because people would be pretty well advanced in years and their premium rate would be pretty high. It would be pretty hard on them after having had this type of insurance for a great many years.

Mr. CORBETT. Here is where the employee does get a real marked advantage. There are many of them in advanced years who could not pass the physical examination required for an ordinary life insurance policy. This conversion privilege for separated employees will allow them to purchase regular insurance which they otherwise could not buy because of disabilities.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the estimated cost to the Federal Government is?

Mr. CORBETT. The estimated cost during the first year of operation would be \$22 million. If the number of covered employees remains constant, the cost in succeeding years cannot be more

than the \$22 million under the terms of the bill. It was believed by the experts who testified before our committee and the Senate committee that the cost would actually be reduced based upon favorable experience with the insurance plan. May I emphasize again, however, that it cannot be more under the terms of the bill than the initial cost planned for the first year.

Mr. GOLDEN. How do these premiums paid by the Federal employees under this bill compare with the premiums when you buy insurance from private companies?

Mr. CORBETT. I am happy that the gentleman asked that question because every bit of testimony and evidence that we can find indicates this will result in the finest term insurance that can be purchased anywhere in the world comparing costs and benefits.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Do I understand this insurance is voluntary on the part of Federal employees?

Mr. CORBETT. Any Federal employee who does not care to participate can be excluded from the fund by a simple written notice.

Mr. PELLY. Is there any assurance or reasonable expectation that the rates will not go up?

Mr. CORBETT. As I answered the gentleman from Kentucky the reasonable assurance is they will go down. Under the terms of the bill employees cannot be charged more than \$6.50 per thousand per year and the Government no more than \$3.25 per thousand per year.

Mr. PELLY. It certainly is a very low rate compared with any group insurance which I have ever heard of in private industry. It seems to me it is a marvelous thing for Federal employees.

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman is right and it is only because of the great number involved that these low rates become possible.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] to answer a few questions for me. I notice there is a formula in the bill to provide for selecting the insurance companies. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not that formula is restrictive and how many companies now writing group insurance would be eligible for this business?

Mr. CORBETT. There are approximately 75 companies that can qualify.

Mr. HARDY. Seventy-five that would qualify under this formula?

Mr. CORBETT. That is right and the formula goes on further, as will be noted, to set up provisions that no one company can get any more than a fair proportion of the total volume. That formula is extremely involved.

Mr. HARDY. I cannot understand it. I thought it might be limited to 3 or 4 different companies.

Mr. CORBETT. No; it is just the reverse. The whole formula is designed

to make any company that can handle the load on this eligible; in fact, it was designed in such a way that some of the present associations of Federal employees that have insurance programs would be eligible to sell this type of insurance. Well over 75 companies meet the test, and nationwide representation in the program would thus be possible.

Mr. HARDY. I cannot be sure of my information, but I was informed about a week ago that the terms of this bill were so restrictive that actually there would not be more than 4 or 5 companies that would get any appreciable business from it.

Mr. CORBETT. The experts and Mr. Folsom assured us that that was absolutely in error, and we accept their word as to that.

Mr. HARDY. I certainly hope that is the case. Now, as to some details: There is a provision in the bill that calls for a reduction in the amount of insurance by 2 percent a month after an individual reaches the age of 65.

Mr. CORBETT. Yes. That is strictly to make it actuarially sound, so that as time goes on and the demands, possibly, from the man's family, or the employee's family, are tending to reduce, the liability of the insuring company is reduced, and I think the gentleman will find that that is in exact accord with these group-insurance programs.

Mr. HARDY. That relates to the employee who is still employed at the age of 65?

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. So, if he is employed at the age of 65, for each full year of employment after 65 his policy is reduced by what percent?

Mr. CORBETT. By 2 percent a month for each month he is over 65, down to a minimum of 25 percent.

Mr. HARDY. So that if he reaches the age of 68 he has only 25 percent as much coverage as he had at 65?

Mr. CORBETT. That is approximately correct.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think he pays no premiums after the age of 65.

Mr. HARDY. I am talking about terms of recovery. Let us pursue that a bit further. If you can clear this up, I will be delighted.

Mr. CORBETT. Of course, we expect that most of these employees are going to take advantage of their retirement situation at the age of 65, and the gentleman must recognize that this plan has got to be kept actuarially sound.

Mr. HARDY. Of course, I agree that the plan must be actuarially sound. As a matter of fact, it is based on average age, anyhow; is that not correct?

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. So, so far as actuarial soundness is concerned, if we wanted to extend it to 70, all you would have to do would be to increase the premium a little.

Mr. CORBETT. That is possible, but remember over 65 he pays no premium at all. This is term insurance, and most term insurance ceases entirely at that age. Here we are starting on a new program. It has been worked over in the light of experience of other large groups, and I would certainly expect that as the years went on and experience has been

gathered with this program that we will find ways to improve it.

Mr. HARDY. Let me inquire further. What provision is made for reducing the amount of deduction? I notice it is provided that as much as \$6.50 a thousand may be deducted from the individual's pay, and that may be increased by half as much more by contributions on the part of Uncle Sam.

Mr. CORBETT. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. HARDY. I want to know what provision there is for reducing that premium payment.

Mr. CORBETT. There is no provision for reducing it. The express hope and prediction was that because of the large expected participation that advantages would accrue that would permit reducing the premiums or increasing the benefits.

Mr. HARDY. Now, speaking in terms of expected participation, can the gentleman tell us what is the average age of Federal employees at the present time?

Mr. CORBETT. The average age of employees at the present time? I cannot answer that, sir.

Mr. HARDY. Of course, the gentleman knows that the rates for group insurance are based on average age, is that not correct?

Mr. CORBETT. I certainly know that is correct, and I think the gentleman also knows that this plan was worked out by insurance experts, not by the committee, and obviously we have to follow the advice of experts in matters of this kind.

Mr. HARDY. I might point out this one aspect of it. I have not had the opportunity to get a great deal of information on it, but I have been told that the average age of Federal employees is about 40. Does the gentleman know whether that is fairly accurate?

Mr. CORBETT. I could not answer that. I think it would require some little research to dig out that information. It seems to me that the average age might be even higher than that.

Mr. HARDY. It might be. I do not know. I have been told that the average age was about 40, and that the experience of the Veterans' Administration with its insurance is that at age 40 pure insurance costs runs a little under \$4 per thousand.

Mr. CORBETT. Let us accept the gentleman's figure. What would be the point?

Mr. HARDY. The point that I was raising is this: Six dollars and fifty cents per thousand sounds to me like a pretty expensive rate, based on the average age of Federal employees, and it seems that the total premium will be \$9.75 when the Government's participation is added.

Mr. CORBETT. I would have to repeat to the gentleman the statement that this is probably the lowest cost term insurance that is purchasable anywhere in the world.

Mr. HARDY. That may or may not be. The only comparison we could have in governmental experience would be United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance, which, I believe, at the age of 40, would show a pure insurance cost of less than

\$4 a thousand, if you are taking average age. There is no administrative expense involved in that figure; I do not want to be misunderstood. But I think the gentleman should also bear in mind that there would be no selling expense entailed in this program.

Mr. CORBETT. There would be absolutely no selling expense and no commissions paid.

Mr. HARDY. It seems to me that we do not yet have all of the answers that we ought to have. I should like to ask one other question, if the gentleman would be good enough to yield further. At age 65 suppose an employee retires; his insurance, at the time he separates from the service lapses unless he undertakes to continue it; is that correct?

Mr. CORBETT. At retirement, the insurance continues in force without further payment of premiums. It does not lapse and the employee is not required to make any additional payments. If the employee, as you state, however, is 65 years of age, the face value of the policy of course is reduced by 2 percent a month, but the employee will receive at least 25 percent of the face value. At this point I might say that in other cases of regular retirement, where the employee goes from employment to retirement, his policy will continue in force at the full face value until he reaches 65. Where the employee is retired before age 65 for disability, or on immediate annuity if he has at least 15 years' service, it will continue at face value until he reaches the age of 65 at which time, in both cases of course, it will become subject to the 2 percent per month reduction factor.

Mr. HARDY. Does he have the option of maintaining 100 percent of his coverage by paying additional premiums?

Mr. CORBETT. Presently, no.

Mr. HARDY. So that, regardless of what happens, when he retires after he reaches age 68, he has only 25 percent coverage; is that correct?

Mr. CORBETT. That is approximately correct. It is reduced by 24 percent a year, and at 68 he would have 28 percent remaining.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I note on page 2 that the cost to the taxpayers under this particular bill would be \$22,750,000 a year; that is correct?

Mr. CORBETT. That is the cost the first year. It is assumed that the cost the first year would be higher than in any subsequent year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Are we justified in giving a special privilege to a group of people, these Federal workers, including ourselves, by voting out a bill of this nature? Does not this go along the line of socialized insurance? I have always objected to socialized medicine.

Mr. CORBETT. I should like to say to the gentleman that I cannot see how anyone can call this socialized insurance. The business is done through private companies. If this is socialized insurance, then the United States Steel Corp., the Westinghouse Corp., the Gulf Oil Co.,

and all the rest of these large companies are guilty of having socialized insurance for their employees. I think I ought to say this further to the gentleman—

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman further explain that cost item of \$22,750,000?

Mr. CORBETT. If the gentleman will allow me to finish the thought I had started to express, I would say to the gentleman that this is a right, a protection, which is given to practically every workman in America who is engaged in an industry that employs large enough groups to have this sort of plan.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have no objection to the plan in itself, but I do question it from the viewpoint of the contribution by our taxpayers to it.

Mr. CORBETT. This figure I think is very significant. A total of 85,000 American firms and organizations are sponsoring this type of insurance for their members. As of December 31, 1952, 37 million persons were covered by group life-insurance policies, aggregating a face value of \$70 billions. In fact, I think it has been a very lamentable fact that we have not had the wisdom to grant this type of insurance to our employees long ago.

So far as allowing all the members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches to participate is concerned, the more who do participate the greater the benefits can be, and the cheaper the cost to each individual.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have no objection to the members of the legislative and judicial branches and others joining in if the bill is to be adopted. My objection is basically as to whether or not we are justified in voting ourselves what appears to me to be a little bonus through the back door of this bill. It is cheap insurance.

Mr. CORBETT. That is a matter for the gentleman's own individual judgment. Some of us here feel that we have been highly unfair to our employees in not giving them the opportunity to purchase this type of insurance. Therefore we think that by any delay in passing this bill we are doing an injustice to the families of the thousand persons in the Federal employ who are dying each month.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I ask the gentleman a further question?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 8 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will be very happy to yield further to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As I have asked the gentleman, will he go a little further into this insurance cost to the taxpayers of \$22,750,000 a year? Are we justified in throwing that load onto the taxpayers for the insuring of Federal employees?

Mr. CORBETT. I want to answer the gentleman's question in the same words that I answered it a moment ago, namely, that we are not justified in withholding this type of insurance from the Fed-

eral employees. Here we have a definite competition with all private industries. I repeat, 37 million American employees have this opportunity. They are participating in group life insurance totaling \$70 billion.

I may say to the gentleman that it is inconceivable to me that we should not with our own employees give them an opportunity to protect their families. There must be literally tens of thousands of our employees who cannot qualify for any kind of insurance. It is entirely just that the Government expend this very modest amount, far less than we put into certain projects that may never yield a dime, \$22 million that will do so much for 2,300,000 of our employees and their families. And we certainly ought to more than make up the money in reduced recruitment and training operations.

I wish the gentleman would search his mind. I think he could vote for this.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the violent reaction with which this discussion of group insurance placed with private companies for the protection of Federal workers has brought forth today.

In my own small business employing about 15 people we have offered group life insurance to all employees since way back in 1936 and in other small business organizations with which I have been associated, this protection was extended many years before social security was thought of. All of the plans in private industry provide for contributions by the employee and employer and most of them have placed the insurance with private insurance companies. Since this is essentially the program we are discussing here today for Federal employees, it would seem to me that this is another example where our Government might well profit by the experience of business and industry in personnel relations.

Mr. CORBETT. Is the gentleman telling me that this is certainly modern personnel management practice?

Mr. BROWNSON. This is simply the type of fringe benefit that private industry has used for the last 30 years, to my knowledge, in its personnel practices.

Mr. CORBETT. I think the gentleman has made a fine contribution to this discussion.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I commend him and the committee on bringing this type of legislation out. As a former Federal employee, I have been somewhat alarmed at what has been going on in the civil service. We have cut down on the annual leave of our Federal employees and many other benefits they have had. This type of benefit is something that has been long overdue. As the gentleman pointed out, almost every large industry in this country has a plan similar to this for its employees. The Federal Government is losing its employees because, for one thing, they

are not paid as well as in private industry. They have no unemployment insurance and they have few other benefits that employees in private industry have. This is the least we can do for them. I think we ought to do more. May I bring out one more point to the gentleman from Minnesota? He seems to be alarmed over the fact that we are including ourselves—I think he called it a bonus—in this legislation. What is wrong with that? I think we need it. I would like to have the gentleman tell me what his position would be if we had a pay raise bill here, as I think we should have. I think more of us ought to be able to stand up and have the courage to do for ourselves what we think should be done, and not be so fearful of the results. I am certain our constituents would approve.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to give the gentleman an opportunity to say how he would vote, if we had a pay raise bill before us.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Thank you, sir. As the Representative of one of the greatest agricultural congressional districts in America, I would feel that this year, as long as the Congress has cut down price-support protection to the farmers of the United States, I certainly could not vote myself any possible increase either in salary or in insurance benefits as in this particular legislation.

Mr. KLEIN. I am glad the gentleman has made his position clear. I would like to remind him, however, that there is no compulsion about it. Neither he nor any other Member is compelled to take the increase. If they do not want it, they can leave it in the Treasury, but I am certain the gentleman, just as every other Member should, would avail himself of whatever benefits were to be had.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge that the House act favorably on this legislation providing for group life insurance for Federal employees.

This measure is recommended and supported by the President and the Bureau of the Budget and is a vital part of an overall plan to improve working conditions and job benefits for Uncle Sam's workers. This program is essential if we are going to adequately compete with private industry in obtaining and retaining the highest quality of personnel. We all know and realize, in order to have the highest efficiency and the greatest economy in our Federal operations, we must have a high level of morale and security for our employees.

It would be most difficult to measure the cost of this insurance program by mere dollars and cents outlay. On the contrary, it must be considered in connection with an effort to increase the efficiency and morale of the Federal service. This insurance program is no more liberal than what is now provided for the employees of thousands of private industries. The Federal Government is just late in recognizing their responsibilities toward their employees. This program has been thoroughly studied and worked out by the administration as well as the House Post Office and Civil Service Com-

mittee. There should be no objection to it and I hope that the House of Representatives will pass it by an overwhelming margin.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the suspending of the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I favor very strongly the action approving S. 3681 to establish an insurance program for Federal employees. I think such a program is excellent, but I have one reservation about the action. This most important legislation was accorded a hearing lasting only one-half hour by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I fear most of the committee members have not even had the opportunity to read the legislation carefully. Such a hasty hearing denies possible consideration of improvements in the proposal and denies a full opportunity for a public hearing on the plan. In spite of the short hearing, the insurance proposal has my full support, for I believe it puts into effect one of the better practices adopted by many private employees. The excellent work done by civilian employees in the Government is too seldom given full recognition. This insurance program will add to the benefits accorded Federal employees.

I trust the House will, during the 84th Congress, make a careful review of the program to be absolutely certain all provisions are equitable and that it provides the best possible plan for Federal employees.

NORTH UNIT IRRIGATION DISTRICT HAYSTACK RESERVOIR ON THE DESCHUTES FEDERAL RECLAMA- TION PROJECT

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2864) to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the North Unit irrigation district, to authorize construction of Haystack Reservoir on the Deschutes Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the contract with the North Unit irrigation district in form substantially similar to that approved by the district directors on July 31, 1953, which has been negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 7, subsection (a), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1192; 43 U. S. C., 1946 edition, sec. 485), is approved and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to execute it on behalf of the United States.

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized to construct the Haystack Dam and equalizing reservoir and related works as a feature of the Deschutes Federal reclamation project at

a cost not in excess of an amount which, together with other project costs reimbursable and returnable to the United States pursuant to the terms and provisions of the contract approved by section 1 of this act, does not exceed the maximum construction charge obligation of the North Unit irrigation district.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GAVIN. I am definitely opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is any Member on the minority side opposed to the bill? [After a pause.] If not, without objection a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, S. 2854, has to do with a project known as the Haystack Reservoir. This is a bill to authorize the construction of a reservoir on a Federal reclamation project and for other purposes. I might call the attention of the House to the fact that this great Government of ours has been trying to effect economies and reduce expenditures and balance the budget; and just the other day, the gentleman from Oregon had a \$22 million reclamation and irrigation project before us. That is the Talent project, and now again they are back here today with another \$12 million reclamation and irrigation project. I presume that the gentleman from Oregon has many other projects in mind, but it would appear not to be good judgment to bring them out more than one at a time. But nobody seems to pay much attention to these programs. I just became a little interested in these many projects.

You will notice the report is in very small print. When a Member comes to the floor he secures a copy of the bill and report, but the small print is usually so difficult to read that he usually pays little attention to it. Therefore, I have selected from the report what I thought would be the significant parts so that I could call them to the attention of the House. Action is entirely up to the House on projects of this kind.

However if you want to spend the American taxpayers' money in this manner, it is \$12 million worth. In fact, according to the report, 174 people are involved in the area. Only 174 people are involved in the \$12 million project. However, it is my opinion that while we have this great overproduction of foodstuffs and hundreds of thousands of acres have been taken out of production, it does not make sense to develop more programs, spend more of the taxpayers' money to put more acreage back into production, whether it is for irrigation or land reclamation, or whatnot.

I think these programs should be held in abeyance until such time as the demands are evident of the need for more land producing more foodstuffs.

This is a project where only 174 people are concerned. It is going to cost \$12 million. This bill before you would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to

execute an amendatory repayment contract with the North Unit Irrigation District, an organization formed under Oregon laws, and represents water users on an irrigated area of 50,000 acres. That is what is involved for \$12 million—174 people and 50,000 acres.

The organization to which they refer, as I stated, represents, according to the report, 174 people. The Federal Government would be laying out cash on the barrel head, \$12 million to irrigate and improve the land of 174 people. That seems to me to be a very high cost. I wonder if any other 174 people any place in the United States would get any consideration for this kind of a project, involving only that number of people. Originally it was proposed that this \$12 million would be paid back in a 50-year period, but I note from the report that it is now to be paid back in 78 years. In fact, there were 4 or 5 bills here today on the Consent Calendar on these same kinds of projects, all of which with a period of 50 years were requested to be extended—amortized for 75 years or more. If they go up to 78 years they may go up to 100 years. Why not make it in perpetuity, take a little here and a little there when the Government may get it. Nobody seems to pay any attention to these contracts.

This one, along with the \$12 million to improve the land, they want the time limit raised from 50 years to 78 years. Why not make it 100?

I ask my friends, while Secretary Benson is restricting farm acreage, why should it be necessary at this time for the Congress to authorize a project that would cost in the neighborhood of \$12 million for 174 people who now request that the loan be extended for 78 years; it would not be paid back for the next several generations. Certainly we have sufficient land in production, and we are flooding out land in many projects, a lot of good land that could be utilized.

I just want to say to the membership that no banker in his right mind would entertain such a loan on a 78-year basis. But apparently my friends from Oregon—and they are my friends and have been for many years—believe it is all right for Uncle Sam to handle a loan for \$12 million on a 78-year basis. I wonder if many of the bankers out in Oregon would entertain a loan on a reclamation or irrigation project on a 2½-percent amortization basis for 78 years? Certainly not. And that is the trouble and the reason why this country of ours is in the condition that it is today. It is just a multiple number of projects of a similar nature of this kind that is breaking the back of the American taxpayer and placing a terrific burden on our people.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. After a bit. For once I have 20 minutes at my disposal.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman ought to be willing to yield 20 seconds.

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly there is not any Member of this House who would even consider asking any banking group to entertain a proposal such as is presented to us here—78 years, \$12 million loan. That is along the line of the 5 bills

here today, to 1 of which I objected. They were 50-year programs and they asked that they be extended to 75 years. This sounds unreasonable.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GAVIN. I will be glad to a little later. In looking over the report I find a letter under date of June 17, 1954, from Donald R. Belcher, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It states in part:

The proposed amendatory contract which would be approved by enactment of S. 2864 would relieve financial difficulties of the North Unit Irrigation District by extending the present irrigation repayment contract period from 40 years to a base period of 78 years, with provision for variable annual repayments to reflect land capabilities and economic conditions.

Sounds good. But in any event the average taxpayer pays the bill. But let us not be fooled by these words, because you are going to put up \$12 million here today for 174 people to irrigate some 50,000 acres.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is in error.

Mr. GAVIN. I am taking this from the report.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is in error.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield at this time. The print is so small and I do not want it to be trying for the Members to read it, so I am bringing it to your attention. This is from the report.

There is another letter under date of June 4 of this year to the Secretary of the Interior, from which I quote in part:

The proposed new repayment contract which would be approved under S. 2864 would remedy the present financial difficulties of the district by extending the present repayment period from 40 years to a base period of 78 years, with an added provision for variable annual payments to reflect land capabilities and economic conditions.

The annual cost, including operation and maintenance and replacements, is estimated to average \$60,000, based on amortizing construction costs in 50 years at 2½ percent.

The Department further recommends that such a study be undertaken subsequent to the authorization of the project.

Under the proposed amendatory contract, the maximum obligation of the district would be \$12,130,000, consisting of \$10,530,000 for the irrigation facilities constructed during the period from about 1938 to 1949, and \$1,600,000 for the proposed Haystack equalizing reservoir and its appurtenant works.

It states further:

Under adverse economic conditions, it is possible that the repayment period would be extended many years beyond the 78-year base period.

Why extend it? Why not write it off, take our loss and call it a day, without further extension?

It is further stated in this letter:

Conversely, with favorable economic conditions, the repayment period could be less than 78 years.

But if you had a bad economic situation it might be up to 100 years. Continuing the letter:

While the Bureau of the Budget, in general, does not approve of extending irrigation repayment contracts over unrealistically long periods of time, in consideration of the financial difficulties and special circumstances connected with the Deschutes, north unit project, and on the basis that a precedent is not established, there would be no objection to amending the existing contract to provide for the longer repayment period.

However, let me point out at this time that in my opinion a precedent is being established:

In addition the Bureau of the Budget believes that under present conditions a reasonable repayment period for Federal irrigation projects should be the useful economic life but not longer than 50 years following completion of construction exclusive, where applicable, of a development period not exceeding 10 years.

But that is not what they want to do here. They want 78 years. They might have made it 88 or 98 years.

That is what they think it ought to be, and if they want to borrow \$10 million on a 10-year basis, that is all right; but when you get into more than 50 years and it is questionable whether or not it can be repaid, I think the Government ought to stay out of that kind of loan business.

The letter states further:

We also believe that, in view of the decision by local interests to construct a system for supplying water for domestic, livestock, and municipal purposes at a cost of about \$3½ million, without Federal assistance, careful consideration should be given to having local interests construct the Haystack equalizing reservoir financed partly with revenues collected by a conservancy district on the basis of the public and secondary benefits and the balance by the water users.

Now, that makes sense to me, that the people out in the area themselves develop a program by which they can finance their own operation, and if there is so much profit in this irrigation business out there as they say and they assure us it is going to be paid back in 78 years, let them finance it themselves and not ask the American taxpayers to finance it.

In another letter under date of June 15 from Fred G. Aandahl, Acting Secretary of the Interior, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, part of which I quote, it is stated:

Under the contract the maximum repayment obligation of the district will be \$12,130,000.

The proposed plan for repayment of this obligation is basically the normal and percentage variable plan provided by the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, using as the base annual installment the sum of \$136,500 until the 50th year following the year, as announced by the Secretary, in which the project is served by an adequate domestic water system. Thereafter, the base annual installment will be \$193,800.

The water users of the North Unit Irrigation District have approved execution of the enclosed contract by a vote of 155 to 19.

In a letter dated June 4, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended that consideration be given to the formation of a conservancy district in connection with the North Unit lands and that provision be made for amortizing the cost of Haystack Reser-

voir over a period of 50 years or less. The Bureau of the Budget has also advised that no commitment can be made as to when funds will be available for construction of Haystack. A copy of the Bureau of the Budget's letter is attached. We recommend that your committee give consideration to its suggestions and that the bill, with such amendments as are called for in the circumstances, be enacted.

Now, I could continue this discussion, but let me say that I think the time has come in this Congress that we look these matters over carefully. In the past usually these bills have been brought in here about 4:30 in the afternoon; there is only a handful of Members on the floor, or under unanimous consent or suspension of the rules they are passed quickly. But, from now on I think we should be watching all of them, because I think the Members of the Congress representing the American people should see that we protect their interests and that we get value received for every dollar that the Government is requested to invest.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then the gentleman thinks that this is a matter important enough that the opposition to it should have more than 20 minutes in order to present the true picture to the Congress who have to vote on the subject.

Mr. GAVIN. I would be glad if the gentleman would ask unanimous consent that the time be increased to discuss this matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In answer to the gentleman I might say that unanimous consent would not lie because it is under suspension of the rules. In other words, we are cut down to 20 minutes if we are opposed to the proposition.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to my good friend from Allegheny County, in summing up what I have to say in 20 minutes allocated to me is this: I think it is an unwise, unsound investment of \$12 million of American taxpayers' money to irrigate 50,000 acres of land involving 174 people. I think it is too costly a proposition and I think the bill should be voted down, as well as all of the rest of projects of a similar nature. Let me ask my friends from the Northwest, would you consider going to a group of bankers in the Northwest and ask them to finance a \$12 million project on a 2½ percent basis for 78 years, because in 78 years is a long time?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman has been in error so many times, at which time I tried to get him to yield and correct him. \$10,530,000 has been already allocated by the Congress years ago, and this bill only carries \$1,600,000 for a new reservoir, for new water for this irrigation project, so that the gentleman has been in error.

Mr. GAVIN. No; I am not in error.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is not \$12 million of new money.

Mr. GAVIN. The whole project will cost \$12,130,000, whether you got the

money in 1939 or you get it in 1954. That is what is involved.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this legislation be voted down.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I have said all along in connection with these flood control projects, of which Pennsylvania is now getting a tremendous sum, that they pay nothing back, not a penny of the cost, neither principal nor interest. These irrigation projects do pay back the principal.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has been in error so many times, that I should like to make this effort to correct him. He refused to yield for the correction. He refers to this \$12 million bill; there is only \$1,600,000 of new money with which to build a reservoir. The rest of the money was appropriated a long time ago.

The gentleman spoke of 174 people who would benefit. The vote of the people was 155 to 19. But the number of acres involved here is 50,000. Under the 160-acre limitation, that takes care of a great many more people, perhaps a thousand to fifteen hundred people in this area who would be affected by this irrigation project.

It is true that they have been in some financial trouble and this bill is brought here in order to correct or to help some of their problems and the conditions with which they are faced. The committee gave consideration to this bill and I think it ought to be passed by the House. The bill provides additional water for 50,000 acres of crops.

At this time I should like to yield to a gentleman of the committee who has been a very valuable member of the committee and has done very much work on these irrigation projects, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the case boils down to this. Those people owe a certain amount of money. They cannot pay it in 40 years. The bill extends the pay-out period to, I believe, 78 years. If they cannot pay out in 40 years, isn't it better for them to pay back in 78 years than for the Government to get nothing at all? There is involved here the question whether or not we want to write off this money as a loss or extend the period within which they can pay back, and permit these people who are willing to assume the continued burden to do so. That is all that this bill amounts to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield to me, this acreage is not new acreage. It is the old acreage of 50,000 acres. But it permits them to have more water on the 50,000 acres for the crops which they put into production. So my colleagues should understand it is not \$12 million. The House and the Appropriations Committee have already taken care of \$10,530,000. This calls for \$1,600,000. The principal will be paid back in 78 years. It will not be like the project of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, where they get \$150 million for a flood-control project and do not pay back 1 penny, not 1 penny of interest or principal. There has been over \$10 billion earmarked for flood control. While I am for flood-control projects, remember they do not pay back interest, they

do not pay back principal. That is about $4\frac{1}{2}$ or 5 times more than ever has been allocated for reclamation projects, where they do pay back the principal on these projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the bill be adopted, and ask my colleagues to so vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad my friend from Pennsylvania is willing to have that figure corrected from \$12 million to \$1,600,000, which is the total amount this bill calls for of new money at this time. The \$10,530,000 was spent over a decade ago and that is already in the project now. There is only \$1,600,000 of new money.

Mr. GAVIN. The whole job was \$12,130,000, including the \$1,600,000 which is new money. At the same time you are asking to bring up the 50-year repayment to 78 years. All told it involves \$12,130,000, even though the money was appropriated back in 1938 and 1939.

Mr. COON. But the gentleman will agree that this bill just calls for \$1,600,000?

Mr. GAVIN. It is evident, yes; but the overall project is \$12,130,000.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter from Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which reads:

MY DEAR MR. COON: We understand that in recent discussions, in which you have participated, in considering H. R. 7647, a bill to approve an amandatory repayment contract negotiated with the North Unit irrigation district, to authorize construction of Haystack Reservoir on the Deschutes Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes, that questions have been raised concerning the useful life of the proposed Haystack Reservoir.

Haystack Reservoir is to be constructed in an offstream site with little or no siltation hazard, and can reasonably be expected to have a useful life well in excess of 78 years.

I think this bill is a meritorious one and should be approved, as it has the full committee support.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN) there were—ayes 61, noes 7.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, S. 3379.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

OAHE DAM, MISSOURI RIVER, AND REHABILITATION OF CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX RESERVATION INDIANS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2233) to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this agreement between the United States of America and the Sioux Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota, Witnesseth, That this agreement when enacted by Congress and when confirmed and accepted in writing by three-quarters of the adult Indians of the Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota, as shown by the tribal rolls of the said reservation, does hereby convey to the United States all tribal, allotted, assigned, and inherited lands or interests within said Cheyenne River Reservation belonging to the Indians of said reservation, which lands are required by the United States for the reservoir to be created by the construction of the dam across the Missouri River in South Dakota, now known as Oahe Dam, including such lands along the margin of said proposed reservoir as may be required by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for the construction, protection, development, and use of said reservoir all as described in part II of this agreement, subject, however, to the conditions of this agreement hereinafter set forth: *Provided*, That the effective date of this act shall be the date when the Secretary of the Interior shall by proclamation declare that this agreement has been ratified and approved in writing by three-quarters of the adult members of said Indians as above defined.

SEC. II. The United States agrees to pay for all said tribal, allotted, assigned, and inherited lands or interest in land, together with all improvements thereon (except the Agency Hospital); and for the stumpage value of standing timber and for severance damages to individual owners within the taking area; and for the bed of the Missouri River so far as it is the eastern boundary of said Cheyenne River Reservation, the sum of \$2,614,778.95. And the United States further agrees to pay for overall tribal severance damages outside the taking area for Oahe Reservoir and for the loss of the annual supply of timber and for the loss of wildlife and wild fruits, the sum of \$3,973,076, in all, \$6,587,854.95, which sum shall be in final and complete settlement of all claims, rights, and demands of said tribe or allottees or heirs thereof arising out of the construction of the Oahe project, and shall be deposited to the credit of said tribe in the Treasury of the United States, to draw interest on the principal thereof at the rate of 4 percent per annum until expended: *Provided*, That the said tribal council shall submit to the Secretary of the Interior for his approval a copy of the schedules on which the sum of \$2,614,778.95 is based, as itemized in this section, and when such schedule is approved by the Secretary of the Interior it shall be the final schedule on which the said sum shall be distributed to or credited to the owners of said lands.

SEC. III. The United States further agrees to appropriate, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to make available from sums so appropriated to be charged against the cost of construction of the Oahe project, further additional appropriations for the special purposes of relocat-

ing and reestablishing the Indian cemeteries, tribal monuments and shrines within the taking area for said reservoir described in part II of this agreement as the tribal council of said Indian tribe shall select and designate, which sums shall be expended on the recommendation of the tribal council with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. IV. The United States further agrees to appropriate, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to make available from sums so appropriated to be charged against the cost of construction of the Oahe project, further additional appropriations which shall be expended upon the request of the tribal council of said Indian tribe with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior for the following purposes:

Relocation and reconstruction of Cheyenne River Agency, relocation and reconstruction of all schools, hospitals, all service buildings, agents and employees quarters, all roads, bridges, and all incidental matters or facilities in connection therewith, at points to be determined by the tribal council of said tribe with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That all the said reconstruction shall provide all said facilities of whatsoever nature in quantity and quality of not less than those now existing on said Cheyenne River Reservation. The relocation of the agency, schools, hospitals, and the replacement and construction of roads and facilities shall be the duty and the obligations of the United States at its own expense, to best serve the Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation and the requests of said tribal council in respect to all matters set out in this section shall be complied with except when compliance is impossible.

SEC. V. In addition to the sum set out in section II hereof, the United States further agrees that it will appropriate and make available a further sum in the total amount of \$6,044,500 which shall likewise be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Indian tribe to draw interest on the principal thereof at the rate of 4 percent per annum until expended for the purpose of complete rehabilitation for all members of said tribe who are residents of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation at the time of the passage of this act, whether or not residing within the taking area of the Oahe project, and for relocating and reestablishing members of said tribe who reside upon such lands conveyed to the United States to the extent that the economic, social, religious, and community life of all said Indians shall be restored to a condition not less advantageous to said Indians than the condition that the said Indians now are in: *Provided*, That said fund provided for in this section shall be expended upon the order and direction of the tribal council of said tribe, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for the purposes set forth in this section.

SEC. VI. The United States agrees that all mineral rights of whatsoever nature at or below the surface within the taking area as described in part II hereof shall be and hereby are reserved to said Indian tribe or individual owners or holders of lands or interests in lands as their interests may appear under section I hereof, subject to future extraction and use by said tribe or said members thereof or their heirs, successors, or assigns, but also subject to all reasonable regulations which may be imposed by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for the protection and use by the United States of the taking area for the purposes of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir project.

SEC. VII. The members of the said Indian tribe shall have the right without charge to cut and remove all timber and to salvage any portion of the improvements within said taking area either by demolition or removal, and the owners of the land

whereon said improvements stand shall have a prior right to such salvage but if said right is waived or not exercised before the date of the notice provided for in section IX hereof, the tribal council shall have the right to designate others to demolish or remove said timber and improvements or in the discretion of the tribal council, said demolition or removal may be undertaken and carried out by said tribal council: *Provided*, That the salvage permitted by this section shall not be construed as "double compensation" as set out in section 2 (b) (2) of Public Law 870, 81st Congress.

SEC. VIII. The United States and the Indian parties to this agreement recognize that a hazard to livestock is created by the rise and fall of the waters to be impounded in Oahe Reservoir. They also recognize that said hazard is not subject to exact determination at this time, therefore the parties to this agreement agree that all hazards which may develop when the annual rise and fall of Oahe Reservoir can reasonably be determined shall be met by the United States by such protective measures as may be necessary to minimize losses to the Indian parties hereto as to livestock only.

SEC. IX. Members of said Indian tribe now residing within the taking area of the project shall have the right without charge to remain on and use the lands hereby conveyed as said lands are now being used from and after the effective date of this act to the point in time where the gates of Oahe Dam are to be closed for the impoundment of the water of the Missouri River. The Chief of Engineers shall give public notice 1 year in advance of the prospective date of the closing of said gates for said purpose and all improvements of whatever nature, all timber of whatever kind or class shall be salvaged or removed or else shall be considered as abandoned by the tribe or by the individual owners at a date 6 months subsequent to the date of the notice given by the Chief of Engineers. All individuals and personal property shall remove or be removed from the taking area before the expiration of the 1-year's notice given by the Chief of Engineers as aforesaid. And the United States shall not be liable for any loss of life or property not so removed from the taking area from and after the expiration of said notice.

SEC. X. After the Oahe Dam gates are closed and the waters of the Missouri River impounded, the said Indian tribe and the members thereof shall have the right to graze stock on the land between the level of the reservoir and the taking line described in part II hereof. The said tribal council and the members of said Indian tribe shall have, without, cost the right of free access to the shoreline of the reservoir including the right to hunt and fish in and on the aforesaid shoreline and reservoir, subject, however, to regulations governing the corresponding use by other citizens of the United States.

SEC. XI. The United States through the Department of the Interior shall render all aid and assistance to individual members of said tribe whose lands are within the said taking area for the purposes of purchasing land in the name of the United States for said individuals and the United States shall reconvey said lands under trust patent to the individual owners upon the selection by said owners of the land which they decide to have purchased for them. The said trust patents shall be in form and effect the same as corresponding trust patents heretofore issued to said individuals. The holders of exchange assignments within the said taking area shall be regarded as holders of trust patents and shall be accorded the same privileges and procedures as holders of land held in trust as in this section provided.

The funds for the purchase of such substitute land in all cases shall be provided by the individual applying for such purchase and reconveyance as is herein described, out of moneys placed to his credit for the transfer

of his lands, improvements, and timber under the authority of this agreement and the subsequent act of Congress herein provided for but no service charge shall be made by the United States in addition to the cost of the substitute allotment. The lands so selected and purchased as substitute allotments may be either within the boundaries of the Cheyenne River Reservation as diminished by this agreement or outside said reservation as may meet the desires of the individuals involved in the several transactions: *Provided*, That no purchase of lands outside the Cheyenne River Reservation shall affect the existing status of such lands, interests, or rights therein, or improvements thereon, with respect to taxation. No prior act of Congress or departmental regulation shall be held to be a bar to the full operation of this section, nor shall the tribal constitution, ordinance, or resolution thereunder be held to be a bar to the full operation of this section, No. XI.

SEC. XII. No part of any expenditure made by the United States under any or all of the provisions of this agreement and the subsequent acts of ratification shall be charged as an offset or counterclaim against any tribal claim which has arisen under any treaty, law, or Executive order of the United States prior to the effective date of taking of said land as provided for in section I hereof and the payment of Sioux benefits as provided for in section 17 of the said act of March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 888), as amended, shall be continued under the provision of section 14 of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), on the basis now in operation without regard to the loss of tribal land within the taking area under the provisions of this agreement.

SEC. XIII. The United States agrees to reimburse the said tribal council for expenses incurred by it and caused by, or incident to, the negotiations which have led up to the making and ratification of this agreement: *Provided*, That such reimbursable expenses do not exceed in the aggregate \$100,000, of which not more than \$50,000 shall be payable as attorney fees. The tribal council shall send a statement to the Secretary of the Army setting out said expenses up to the date of the proclamation to be issued by the Secretary of the Interior declaring that the act of Congress approving this agreement is in full force and effect. The Secretary of the Army shall forward said statement to the Congress for appropriation together with his recommendations.

SEC. XIV. Holders of inherited lands or interests in lands may consolidate their interests by and between themselves and the total proceeds in the hands of any individual held by such consolidation of interests may be used by any individual holder of the same for purchase of substitute lands as in section XI provided.

SEC. XV. The right of any individual member of said Indian tribe to reject the final appraisal made on his land and improvements shall be preserved and, if any individual does reject such final appraisal, he shall file notice of such rejection by notice in writing to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, who shall thereupon file a proceeding in the United States District Court of the District of South Dakota as in a condemnation proceeding and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon said court to determine, by procedure corresponding to a condemnation proceeding, the value of said land and improvements and the said tribal council shall deposit with the clerk of said court the full amount set out in the final appraisal which was previously offered to said individual, which fund shall be used in payment in full or in part of the final judgment of said United States district court. Cost of such proceedings shall be borne by the United States and the individual involved shall be entitled to counsel at his own expense. In the event the amount of the ap-

praisal so deposited in said court is not enough to cover the final judgment in said proceeding, the United States shall pay such difference from the fund of \$6,587,854.95 established under section II hereof into the hands of the clerk of said court and thereupon title shall vest in the United States.

SEC. XVI. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$12,732,354.95, as provided by sections II, V, and XIII, exclusive of the sums to be charged against the cost of construction of the Oahe project as provided in sections III and IV hereof.

PART II

The lands conveyed by this agreement are the following tracts of land, all in the State of South Dakota:

Township 5 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 5: Northwest quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; north half northwest quarter; north half southeast quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 6: Northeast quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter; north half northwest quarter northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter northwest quarter.

Township 6 north, range 29 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: Lots 1, 2, 5, and 6.

Township 6 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 28: Southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 33: Northeast quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter.

Township 7 north, range 29 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 21: All.

Section 34: Southeast quarter.

Township 7 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 19: Lots 1, 2, and 3.

Section 20: Lot 1.

Section 29: Lots 1, 2, and 3.

Section 30: Northeast quarter northeast quarter; east half southeast quarter northeast quarter; north half northwest quarter northeast quarter; north half northeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 31: West half northeast quarter; lots 6, 7, and 8.

Section 32: Lot 1.

Township 8 north, range 23 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: Lots 5 and 6.

Township 9 north, range 23 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 36: South half southwest quarter and lots 2, 3, and 4.

Township 9 north, range 24 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 12: South half; south half northeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter; east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Section 13: West half northwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Section 14: South half; south half northwest quarter; west half southwest quarter northeast quarter; east half southeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 15: Southeast quarter northeast quarter; south half southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 22: North half northeast quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter; lots 2 and 3; lot 1 except 10 acres in the form of a square situated in the northwest corner thereof.

Section 23: Northwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter; lots 6, 7, 8, and 9.
 Section 27: Lots 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10; lot 7, except 10 acres in the form of a square, situated in the northwest corner thereof.

Section 28: South half southeast quarter; south half north half southeast quarter.

Section 31: Southeast quarter northeast quarter; lots 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Section 32: South half south half northwest quarter; lots 8 and 9.

Section 33: Lots 5 and 6.

Section 34: Northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 1, 2, and 3.
Township 9 north, range 25 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: East half southeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter; south half northwest quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; north half southeast quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter; north half southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 2: Southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 7: South half southwest quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter; south half of lot 5, lots 3, 4, 11, and 12.

Section 9: West half southwest quarter; south half southeast quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 10: Southeast quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter; south half southeast quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 11: South half southwest quarter southwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 12: North half northeast quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 13: South half southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 14: Lots 5, 6, and 7.

Section 15: North half; lots 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Section 16: Northwest quarter; north half northeast quarter; lots 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Section 17: Lots 1 and 10.

Section 18: East half northwest quarter; west half northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; lots 1, 2, and 3.

Section 23: Lot 3.

Section 24: Lots 6, 7, and 8.

Township 9 north, range 26 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: Lot 8 (formerly known as lot 7).

Section 3: Northwest quarter northwest quarter; north half northeast quarter northwest quarter; lot 5.

Section 4: Northwest quarter; north half northeast quarter; north half southeast quarter northeast quarter; north half southwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 2, 3, and 4.

Section 5: East half; southwest quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter; east half northwest quarter northwest quarter; north half southeast quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 6: Southeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter; south half northeast quarter southwest quarter; south half of lot 3; lot 4.

Section 7: North half north half north-east quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 8: Southwest quarter; northeast quarter; north half northwest quarter northwest quarter; east half southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter; lot 1.

Section 9: West half northwest quarter; lots 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Section 10: Lot 5.

Section 17: West half west half; northeast quarter northwest quarter; west half southeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10.

Section 18: Southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter; south half northeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter; east half northwest quarter northeast quarter; east half southeast quarter northwest quarter; south half of lot 4.

Section 19: Lots 7, 8, and 9.

Section 20: Lots 4 and 5.

Township 9 north, range 27 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: Lots 8 and 11.

Section 2: Lots 9 and 12.

Section 3: Lot 5.

Section 5: Lot 5.

Section 6: Northeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 8, 9, and 10.

Section 10: North half northeast quarter northeast quarter; north half south half northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 11: North half northwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 12: Lot 2.

Township 9 north, range 28 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 4: Lots 5 and 6.

Section 5: North half northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; lots 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11.

Section 6: Lots 7, 8 and 11.

Section 7: Lots 14 and 15.

Township 9 north, range 29 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: All.

Section 2: North half.

Section 3: North half north half.

Section 4: Southeast quarter northeast quarter; lot 4.

Township 9 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

All.

Township 10 north, range 26 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 10: Southwest quarter southwest quarter; west half southeast quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 14: South half southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 15: West half west half; west half east half west half; east half southeast quarter southwest quarter; west half southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 16: Northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 19: East half southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 20: West half southwest quarter; south half southwest quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 22: Southeast quarter; east half west half; east half west half northwest quarter; east half northwest quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; west half southeast quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 23: Southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter

southwest quarter; south half southeast quarter northwest quarter; west half northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; south half northeast quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 24: North half southwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter; west half southeast quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter; west half southeast quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter; west half northwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 25: Southwest quarter; south half southeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; south half northwest quarter; northwest quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 26: North half; north half south half; south half southeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter; east half southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 27: North half northeast quarter northwest quarter; north half northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; south half southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 28: Southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter; east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter; west half northwest quarter; west half southeast quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 29: Northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half northeast quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter; north half southwest quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 32: South half southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 33: South half south half; southwest quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half northeast quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 34: All.

Section 35: North half; west half southwest quarter southeast quarter; lot 5.

Section 36: Northeast quarter; north half northwest quarter; lots 6 and 7.

Township 10 north, range 27 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 15: Southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 16: Southeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; east half northwest quarter southwest quarter; north half southeast quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; west half northeast quarter northwest quarter; east half west half northwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 21: North half northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 22: South half southeast quarter; south half northwest quarter southeast

quarter; northwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter; north half southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter; east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; west half southeast quarter northwest quarter; west half northwest quarter.

Section 23: Southwest quarter southwest quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 24: Southeast quarter northeast quarter; west half northeast quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter; east half southwest quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half southeast quarter southeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 25: Southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; west half southwest quarter southeast quarter; south half southwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 26: South half; south half north half; south half northeast quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 27: Northeast quarter; north half northeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter; south half south half southeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 28: Southwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter; west half southeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 29: East half southeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; south half southwest quarter southwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 30: South half southeast quarter; east half southeast quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; south half of lot 4.

Section 31: Northeast quarter; east half northwest quarter; east half southwest quarter; north half north half southeast quarter; lots 1 and 2.

Section 32: North half; west half southwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; lots 3, 4, and 5.

Section 33: Northwest quarter; south half northeast quarter; south half north half northeast quarter; northwest quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Section 34: Northeast quarter; north half northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter; south half north half northwest quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 3, 4, and 5.

Section 35: Northwest quarter; north half northeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; north half northwest quarter southwest quarter; north half southeast quarter southwest quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; north half southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 36: Northwest quarter; southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter;

northwest quarter northeast quarter; south half northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Township 10 north, range 28 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: North half southwest quarter southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 2: South half; south half north half; lots 3 and 4; the south twenty acres of lot 2.

Section 3: Southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter; south half southeast quarter southwest quarter; west half southwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter; lots 1 and 2.

Section 4: South half; south half north half; lot 4; the south 20 acres of lot 2; the south twenty acres of lot 3.

Section 5: All.

Section 6: South half northeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter; north half southeast quarter southeast quarter; lots 1 and 2.

Section 8: North half northeast quarter; north half south half northeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; east half east half southeast quarter.

Section 9: All.

Section 10: All.

Section 11: All.

Section 12: South half; south half north half; south half north half north half.

Section 13: East half northeast quarter southwest quarter; west half northwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 14: Lots 2, 3, and 4.

Section 15: All.

Section 16: All.

Section 17: East half east half northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 19: East half southwest quarter; west half southeast quarter; west half east half southeast quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; east half southeast quarter northwest quarter; south half northeast quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 3 and 4; lot 2 except the east twenty acres thereof.

Section 20: Northeast quarter; west half southeast quarter; east half northeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 1 and 2.

Section 21: All.

Section 24: Lots 1, 2, and 3.

Section 29: West half east half; east half east half northwest quarter; east half northeast quarter southwest quarter; south half southwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Section 30: West half east half; east half west half; west half east half northeast quarter; east half southeast quarter; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Section 31: East half.

Section 32: All.

Section 33: All.

Township 10 north, range 29 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: East half southeast quarter; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half southwest quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; lots 1 and 2; east half of lot 3.

Section 4: Southwest quarter southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 5: East half southwest quarter northeast quarter; west half southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter; west half northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter; west half southwest quarter; west half southeast quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 6: Southeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; north half southeast quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; lots 4 and 5; north half of lot 6.

Section 7: Northeast quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; south half southeast quarter northwest quarter; lot 2; south half of lot 1.

Section 8: East half; northwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 9: West half west half; west half east half southwest quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter; north half northwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter; south half northeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 12: East half southeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter; south half southwest quarter northeast quarter; north half northeast quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 13: Northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 16: North half northwest quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 17: West half; west half east half; northeast quarter northeast quarter; west half southeast quarter northeast quarter; west half northeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 18: North half southeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter; east half southeast quarter southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter; lots 3 and 4.

Section 19: West half northeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 1 and 3.

Section 20: East half west half; west half east half; east half southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; south half northeast quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 21: South half; south half northwest quarter; south half north half northwest quarter; west half southwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 22: Northwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 24: South half southeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; west half northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; east half northeast quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 25: East half east half; east half west half southeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 27: Southwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 28: West half; north half northeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; west half northwest quarter southeast quarter; south half southeast quarter.

Section 29: Southeast quarter; east half northeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; east half northwest quarter

northeast quarter; east half west half north-west quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 30: Lots 2 and 5.

Section 32: Lot 3.

Section 33: North half northwest quarter; northeast quarter; east half southeast quarter; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 34: South half; south half north-west quarter; south half north half north-west quarter; west half southwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 35: South half.

Section 36: South half south half; north-east quarter southeast quarter; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter; south-east quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; south half southeast quarter north-east quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter; north half north-east quarter northeast quarter.

Township 10 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: South half northwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Section 2: South half northeast quarter; west half southeast quarter; west half west half east half southeast quarter; south half southwest quarter; south half northeast quarter southwest quarter; lots 1 and 2.

Section 3: East half southeast quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter south-east quarter southeast quarter.

Section 4: Southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter; southwest quarter south-east quarter; south half northwest quarter southeast quarter; northwest quarter north-west quarter southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter northeast quarter; lot 4, except ten acres, in the form of a square, situated in the northeast corner of said lot 4.

Section 5: East half southeast quarter; south half southwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter north-east quarter; lot 1; east half of lot 2.

Section 6: West half southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter; west half southwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 4, 5, 6, and 7; ten acres, in the form of a square, situated in the southwest corner of lot 3.

Section 7: All.

Section 8: East half east half; north half northwest quarter northeast quarter; south-east quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; east half southwest quarter north-east quarter; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter north-west quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter; west half southwest quarter; west half northeast quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter; west half southeast quarter northwest quarter; west half north-west quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 9: West half; southeast quarter; south half south half northeast quarter.

Section 10: South half southeast quarter; southwest quarter; south half southwest quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; east half northeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; east half northwest quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 11: North half north half; south-west quarter northeast quarter; north half southwest quarter; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Section 14: All.

Section 15: All.

Section 16: All.

Section 17: All.

Section 18: East half; east half west half; lot 1.

Section 19: Northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter northwest quarter; north-west quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; east half southeast quarter; east half northwest quarter south-east quarter; west half southeast quarter southwest quarter; lot 4.

Section 20: All.

Section 29: All.

Section 30: All.

Section 31: All.

Township 10 north, range 31 east, Black Hills meridian

All.

Township 11 north, range 28 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 27: Southwest quarter; south half southeast quarter; south half north half southeast quarter; southeast quarter north-west quarter; east half southwest quarter northwest quarter; south half northeast quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 28: East half southeast quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter south-east quarter; east half southwest quarter northeast quarter; west half southeast quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 29: Southwest quarter; west half west half southeast quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 30: East half east half northeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 31: West half southeast quarter; south half southeast quarter southeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; north half southeast quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; lots 2 and 3; north half of lot 4; ten acres, in the form of a square, situated in the southwest corner of lot 1.

Section 32: Southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter; south half northwest quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; east half west half; northwest quarter northwest quarter; east half southwest quarter north-west quarter; east half west half southwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 33: Southwest quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 34: East half; east half west half; north half northwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 35: West half southwest quarter; west half east half southwest quarter; south-east quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; west half southwest quarter north-west quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 36: East half northeast quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter north-east quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half east half southeast quarter.

Township 11 north, range 29 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 23: Southeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 24: Southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter; east half southwest quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 25: Southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter; northwest quarter north-west quarter; south half northeast quarter

northwest quarter; northwest quarter north-west quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter; west half southeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 26: North half northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half east half north-east quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 31: West half southwest quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter north-west quarter southeast quarter; ten acres, in the form of a square, situated in the southwest corner of lot 1; lot 2 except ten acres, in the form of a square, situated in the northeast corner of said lot 2.

Section 36: East half; east half east half southwest quarter; east half southeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter; north half northwest quarter northwest quarter.

Township 11 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: All.

Section 2: South half; southwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter north-west quarter; east half southwest quarter northwest quarter; lots 1, 2, and 5; east half of lot 3.

Section 11: East half east half; east half west half east half; west half southwest quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 12: All.

Section 13: All.

Section 14: East half northeast quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter; east half southwest quarter northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 23: East half southeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 24: Northwest quarter; east half southwest quarter; west half southeast quarter; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Section 25: East half southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; north-west quarter northeast quarter; north half southwest quarter northeast quarter; south-east quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; lot 1.

Section 26: Southeast quarter southwest quarter; east half southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 29: West half southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 31: Lots 2, 3, and 4; lot 1 except 10 acres, in the form of a square, situated in the northeast corner of said lot 1.

Section 32: East half northeast quarter; east half southwest quarter northeast quarter; west half east half southeast quarter; east half west half southeast quarter.

Section 35: Southeast quarter; west half northeast quarter; west half southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter southwest quarter; east half southeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 36: Southeast quarter; east half east half northeast quarter; west half southwest quarter; south half southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Township 11 north, range 31 east, Black Hills meridian

All.

Township 12 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: Northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter southeast quarter; lot 5.

Section 2: Southwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter; west half southeast quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter; west half southwest quarter northwest quarter; lot 4.

Section 3: All.

Section 4: East half southwest quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 1, 2, and 3; east half of lot 4.

Section 10: East half; northeast quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 11: All.

Section 12: All.

Section 13: All.

Section 14: North half; northeast quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter; west half southeast quarter; lots 1 and 2.

Section 22: South half southwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 23: Northwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; west half east half; southeast quarter southeast quarter, lots 1, 2, and 3.

Section 24: All.

Section 25: All.

Section 26: Southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter; south half northwest quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter; west half southeast quarter; lots 1 and 2.

Section 27: East half; east half west half; northwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 34: Northeast quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 35: Northwest quarter; west half east half; east half east half southwest quarter; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Section 36: All.

Township 12 north, range 31 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: Southwest quarter; west half southeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter; lots 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7.

Section 2: South half southeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter; south half north half; south half south half southwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter; north half northwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Section 3: All.

Section 4: All.

Section 5: All.

Section 6: Southeast quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter; lots 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

Section 7: All.

Section 10: All.

Section 11: All.

Section 12: Northwest quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Township 13 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: Lot 1.

Section 31: Southeast quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter; south half southeast quarter northeast quarter; north half northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 32: South half; south half south half northwest quarter.

Section 33: West half southeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; west half southwest quarter northeast quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 34: Southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 36: Southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter; east half west half southwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; west half southeast quarter northeast quarter.

Township 13 north, range 31 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 3: Southwest quarter northwest quarter; lots 3, 4, and 5.

Section 4: All.

Section 5: South half northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; lots 1 and 2.

Section 6: North half southeast quarter; north half south half southeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter; north half south half northwest quarter; lots 3 and 4.

Section 8: Southeast quarter southeast quarter; east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 9: Southwest quarter; east half northwest quarter; west half northeast quarter; lot 4.

Section 16: All.

Section 17: Southeast quarter southeast quarter; east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half southeast quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter; east half northwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 20: East half east half northeast quarter.

Section 21: Northwest quarter; east half southwest quarter; west half west half southeast quarter; lots 2, 4, 6, and 7.

Section 27: All.

Section 28: West half northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter northwest quarter; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter; north half southeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter; lots 1 and 2.

Section 30: South half southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 31: South half; northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 32: Southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter; south half northwest quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; south half southeast quarter; west half northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 33: West half southwest quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter; south half southwest quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 34: Southwest quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter; north half southeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter; north half northwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter; north half southeast quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter; north half northwest quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; lots 1, 2, and 3.

Section 35: All.

Township 14 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 36: East half southeast quarter; south half southeast quarter northeast quarter; south half northwest quarter southeast quarter; north half southwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter; south half north half southwest quarter; north half southeast

quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Township 14 north, range 31 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: All.

Section 2: South half northeast quarter; east half southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; south half southwest quarter northwest quarter; north half south half; southwest quarter southwest quarter; west half southeast quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; north half southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter; lots 1, 2, 5, and 6.

Section 3: South half; south half south half northwest quarter; south half southwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 4: South half south half northeast quarter; south half northwest quarter; lots 3 and 4.

Section 5: Lot 1 except the south 20 acres thereof.

Section 10: Northwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; east half northwest quarter southwest quarter; north half north half southeast quarter.

Section 11: Northwest quarter; east half southwest quarter; north half northwest quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter; west half southwest quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter; lots 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Section 14: East half northwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter; west half southwest quarter; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Section 15: East half southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter; south half southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 22: North half northeast quarter; north half northeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 23: All.

Section 26: All.

Section 27: East half; southeast quarter northwest quarter; south half northeast quarter northwest quarter; east half east half southwest quarter; east half west half east half southwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 28: South half southeast quarter.

Section 31: South half southwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter; south half southwest quarter northwest quarter; east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 32: North half southwest quarter; south half southwest quarter northwest quarter; west half southeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 33: Northeast quarter; east half northwest quarter; north half northwest quarter northwest quarter; south half southeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter; south half southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 34: All.

Section 35: All.

Township 15 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: Lot 1 except the south 20 acres thereof.

Township 15 north, range 31 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 3: Southwest quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter; north half southwest quarter southwest quarter; east half southeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Section 4: East half southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half west half southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; lot 1; lot 2 except the south twenty acres thereof.

Section 6: Lot 1 except the south twenty acres thereof; lot 2 except the south twenty acres thereof; lot 3 except the south twenty acres thereof; lot 4 except the south twenty acres thereof.

Section 10: Northeast quarter northwest quarter; east half east half northwest quarter northwest quarter; east half southwest quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; lots 1 and 2.

Section 11: Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Section 13: West half southwest quarter; west half southeast quarter southwest quarter; west half east half southeast quarter southwest quarter; lot 2.

Section 14: Southeast quarter southeast quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter; north half southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 15: North half southeast quarter; north half south half southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 24: South half southwest quarter.

Section 25: All.

Section 26: North half; east half southeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter; northwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter; north half northeast quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 27: South half northeast quarter northeast quarter; north half southeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 32: South half southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 33: South half southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 35: East half northeast quarter; southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter; east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 36: Northwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 1, 2, and 3.

Township 16 north, range 28 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 13: South half southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 23: Northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; north half southeast quarter southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 24: North half northwest quarter; northeast quarter; north half southeast quarter; north half south half southeast quarter; north half southeast quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Township 16 north, range 29 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: Southeast quarter; south half southwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 2: South half; south half southwest quarter northeast quarter; south half southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter; lot 4.

Section 3: South half southeast quarter; south half north half southeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half of lot 1.

Section 7: South half southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 8: South half south half southwest quarter.

Section 9: Northeast quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 10: East half.

Section 11: North half; north half south half; southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 12: North half; southwest quarter; west half southeast quarter; west half east half southeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 13: Northwest quarter northeast quarter; north half southwest quarter northeast quarter; north half southeast quarter northwest quarter; west half northwest quarter; west half west half southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 14: East half northeast quarter; west half northwest quarter.

Section 15: East half northeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter; west half southeast quarter; west half east half southeast quarter.

Section 16: South half north half; west half northwest quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; north half southwest quarter; east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; east half southeast quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter.

Section 17: East half northwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter; north half southwest quarter northeast quarter; south half south half northeast quarter; north half northeast quarter southeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; north half southwest quarter southeast quarter; west half southwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; north half southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 18: East half east half; east half southwest quarter southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter southwest quarter; lot 4.

Section 19: North half northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; north half northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter; east half northwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter; lots 1, 2, and 3.

Section 20: Northwest quarter; north half northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; west half southwest quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter; north half southwest quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 21: Northeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; west half northeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 22: Northwest quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 24: West half northwest quarter.

Township 16 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: Southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter; south half southeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; lots 3 and 4; west half of lot 2.

Section 2: All.

Section 3: All.

Section 4: Southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter; south half southwest quarter; south half north half southwest quarter.

Section 5: South half; south half northwest quarter; south half south half northeast quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; lot 4; the south twenty acres of lot 3.

Section 6: Southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter; south half northeast quarter; south half southeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 1, 2, 6 and 7; east half of lot 3; south half of lot 5.

Section 7: Northeast quarter; east half northwest quarter; east half southeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; lots 1 and 2; the east twenty acres of lot 3; ten acres, in the form of a square, situated in the northeast corner of lot 4.

Section 8: North half; north half south half; southeast quarter southeast quarter; north half southwest quarter southeast quarter; west half southwest quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 9: All.

Section 10: North half; northeast quarter southeast quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter; west half northeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 11: Northeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; west half northeast quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; north half southwest quarter; east half southeast quarter southwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; west half northwest quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; north half southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; north half southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; east half northeast quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; east half southwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; east half southwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter; east half southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; east half northwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; east half northwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; south half southwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 12: North half; east half southeast quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter southeast quarter; north half northwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 13: South half northeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter; east half northwest quarter northeast quarter; south half southeast quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter; south half.

Section 16: North half northwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter; north half southwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 17: Northeast quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter northwest quarter.

Section 18: North half northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 24: Northeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Township 16 north, range 31 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 1: All.

Section 2: East half southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half southwest quarter southeast quarter;

southeast quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter; lot 1.

Section 6: South half southwest quarter; west half southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 7: West half; southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter; south half northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 8: West half southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Section 10: West half southeast quarter; west half east half southeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter; east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 11: Southwest quarter northeast quarter; east half northwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; east half northeast quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter; east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Section 14: All.

Section 15: Northeast quarter; east half east half northwest quarter; north half southeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter; east half southwest quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter southwest quarter; lot 1.

Section 16: Southwest quarter; west half northwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 17: West half southeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter; west half west half; northeast quarter northwest quarter; north half southeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 18: All.

Section 19: North half; east half southeast quarter; east half west half southeast quarter.

Section 20: West half; northeast quarter; north half southeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter; west half southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Section 21: Northwest quarter; east half east half; east half west half southeast quarter; east half northwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 22: All.

Section 27: All.

Section 28: All.

Section 29: All.

Section 30: East half east half.

Section 31: Southeast quarter; south half southwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; south half northwest quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; south half northeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter; east half northwest quarter northeast quarter.

Section 32: North half; north half southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter; northwest quarter southeast quarter; west half northeast quarter southeast quarter; west half southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 33: Southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter; north half northwest quarter; east half southeast quarter northwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter; lot 1.

Section 34: All.

Township 17 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 28: Southeast quarter southwest quarter; east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest

quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 31: Ten acres, in the form of a square, situated in the southwest corner of lot 4.

Section 33: East half west half; southwest quarter southwest quarter; east half northwest quarter southwest quarter; east half west half northwest quarter; west half southeast quarter; southeast quarter southeast quarter; south half northeast quarter southeast quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 34: Southwest quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter; south half southeast quarter southwest quarter; south half southwest quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter; west half southeast quarter southeast quarter.

Township 17 north, range 31 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 6: North half southwest quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; lot 7.

Section 7: Southeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter; east half southwest quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 8: Lots 2, 3 and 4.

Section 17: Southwest quarter northwest quarter; north half southwest quarter; north half southeast quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter; north half southwest quarter southeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter; lots 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Section 18: North half northeast quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; east half northeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter.

Section 20: North half northeast quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 21: Southeast quarter southwest quarter; southwest quarter northwest quarter; north half northwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Section 27: All.

Section 28: East half southeast quarter; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter; north half southwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; lots 1 and 2.

Section 33: Northeast quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter; southeast quarter northwest quarter; east half southwest quarter northwest quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Township 119 north, range 78 west, fifth principal meridian

Section 5: Lot 6.

Township 120 north, range 78 west, fifth principal meridian

Section 29: Lots 5, 6, and 7.

Section 32: Lots 5 and 6.

Township 123 north, range 78 west, fifth principal meridian

Section 30: Lots 5 and 6.

Township 123 north, range 79 west, fifth principal meridian

Section 24: Lot 4.

Section 25: Lot 1.

An unsurveyed island in the Missouri River situated opposite sections 3 and 4 of township 9 north, range 29 east, Black Hills meridian.

An unsurveyed island in the Missouri River, situated opposite sections 2, 3, and 4 of township 9 north, range 29 east of the Black Hills meridian, also sections 21, 22, and 23 of township 115 north, range 81 west of the fifth principal meridian.

An unsurveyed island in the Missouri River, situated opposite sections 1 and 2 of township 9 north, range 29 east, Black Hills meridian.

An unsurveyed island in the Missouri River, situated opposite sections 1 and 2 of township 9 north, range 29 east of the Black Hills meridian, also sections 23 and 24 of township 115 north, range 81 west and section 19 of township 115 north, range 80 west of the fifth principal meridian.

An unsurveyed island in the Missouri River, situated opposite sections 14, 15, 16, and 21 of township 10 north, range 28 east of the Black Hills meridian, also sections 33, 34, and 35 of township 116 north, range 82 west of the fifth principal meridian.

An unsurveyed island in the Missouri River, situated opposite sections 19, 29, 30, and 32 of township 10 north, range 29 east of the Black Hills meridian, also section 1 of township 115 north, range 82 west of the fifth principal meridian.

An unsurveyed island in the Missouri River, situated within section 12, township 12 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian, between Lafferty Island, a surveyed island, and the right bank of said Missouri River.

An unsurveyed island in the Missouri River, situated opposite sections 12, 13, 14, and 23 of township 12 north, range 30 east of the Black Hills meridian, also sections 29, 30, and 31 of township 118 north, range 79 west of the fifth principal meridian.

An unsurveyed island in the Missouri River, situated opposite sections 22, 27, 28, and 33 of township 16 north, range 31 east of the Black Hills meridian, also sections 5, 6, and 7 of township 121 north, range 78 west of the fifth principal meridian.

An unsurveyed island in the Missouri River, situated opposite sections 14, 15, and 22 of township 16 north, range 31 east of the Black Hills meridian, also section 5 of township 121 north, range 78 west and sections 28, 32, and 33 of township 122 north, range 78 west of the fifth principal meridian.

The following described land is described in the foregoing reservation description, but is owned by Indian fee patents to individual Indians:

Township 9 north, range 24 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 13: West half northwest quarter; northwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 6, 7, and 9.

Section 14: East half southeast quarter.

Township 10 north, range 28 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 10: South half southwest quarter.

Section 15: Lots 2 and 3.

Township 12, north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 11: South half south half.

Section 12: South half south half southwest quarter southwest quarter; lots 3, 5, and 6.

Section 13: Lots 1 and 2.

Section 14: North half; east half northwest quarter southeast quarter; northeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter; lot 1; the north six hundred and sixty feet of lot 2.

Township 14 north, range 31 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 11: lot 4.

Township 15 north, range 31 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 3: Southwest quarter northwest quarter; lots 1, 2, and 3.

Section 13: West half east half southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Township 16 north, range 29 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 17: North half northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half northwest quarter; north half northeast quarter southwest quarter; northwest quarter northeast quarter; north half southwest quarter northeast quarter; southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter; northwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 18: East half southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Section 19: Northeast quarter northeast quarter.

Section 20: North half southwest quarter; north half southwest quarter southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Township 16 north, range 30 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 7: East half east half.

Section 8: North half south half north-west quarter.

Section 11: East half east half northeast quarter; northeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter; east half southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 12: West half northwest quarter.

Township 16 north, range 31 east, Black Hills meridian

Section 28: Northwest quarter; west half northeast quarter; lots 1 and 2.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put the question.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, while this does not involve too great a sum of money, it is, in my judgment, one of the most important bills to come before this Congress at this session, because it demonstrates a trend in the program of this administration to put more business in Government and get the Government out of as much business as possible.

The Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, have spent more than 123 hours in holding hearings and studying the problems of the various Indians and tribes of Indians in the United States. In addition to that, we have visited a dozen reservations with a view of getting a first-hand knowledge of the conditions and needs and desires of these tribes.

This Congress has already passed legislation which will terminate the Federal supervision over six groups of Indians, and I stress the point that in every instance the Indians themselves have either asked for this terminal legislation

and have helped to work out the terminal program, or have given their assent to it.

The first bill we passed authorized withdrawal of Federal supervision over the Indians of Wisconsin involving more than 3,300 Indians. The next withdrew supervision over 4 tribes of Indians in Utah involving 360 Indians. Today we have passed withdrawal bills over tribes in western Oregon involving 2,100 Indians. Another bill authorized withdrawal over the Alabama and Coushatta tribes of Texas involving 600 Indians, as well as part of the Uintah and Ouray Reservations in Utah involving 439 Indians, and the Klamath in Oregon involving 2,000 Indians.

The bill before us now is a bill which authorizes settlement for land damages on the Cheyenne Indian Reservation of the Sioux Tribe of South Dakota and authorizes a rehabilitation program for these people, to put them in shape to where in a period of 10 or 15 years they, too, will be ready to throw off the shackles of Federal supervision.

As I stated, this legislation provides settlement with the Indians for 104,420 acres of the best bottomland on this reservation consisting of 1,614,682,000 acres of Indian-owned land. The Government is taking this land for a reservoir back of the Oahe Dam on the Missouri River. The Oahe Dam is 1 of 4 large earthen dams to be constructed on the main stem of the Missouri River in North and South Dakota, to provide flood control for the basin States below Yankton and Sioux City. With Fort Peck, these dams are intended to store flood waters, to generate power for the area, and to furnish some irrigation and some navigation below Sioux City, Iowa.

The Missouri River development program is a tremendous program involving a basin which embraces one-sixth of the entire continental United States, but more than that, it involves the lives and future of many hundreds of Indians, 2,540 of whom live on this particular reservation. There are 4,360 Indians enrolled here, 2,540 living here, constituting 575 families of which 200 families must be removed from the taking area.

When these 200 families are moved back and crowded into the remaining area, it will disrupt the present living of the entire group. In order to make it possible for those who are presently living on lands not being covered, to be able to assimilate the 200 families removed from the taking area and make it possible for them to get their feet on the ground and become assimilated into the balance of the reservation, the subcommittee worked out a program of rehabilitation. This program is intended to assist part of them to go into the livestock business; build up their homes and ranch units; some of them to go into farming; some of them to be trained through vocational training and higher education which will be financed out of this rehabilitation program. Some can go into business enterprises either for themselves or be employed by someone else, which will help them get off the reservation where they cannot presently earn a living; and to become trained and located in a community where they can make a living, where they can raise their

families and where they can become assimilated so that in 10 or 15 years this reservation will be in a position to come before the Congress and ask for termination of Federal supervision the same as the reservations that this Congress has already acted upon.

The subcommittee took into account the fact that there are many Indians on this reservation who are beyond the age of effective rehabilitation; it took into consideration the fact that there are many who cannot profitably be reestablished, and provided for those families a program of assistance. A program of welfare has been established from the interest on a \$2 million perpetual investment.

I refer you to the Committee report wherein the Indian program of rehabilitation for these people has been set out in detail. As an illustration of the good intention and desire of these Indian people to work out this program and to get the greatest results from it, they have asked that these funds be earmarked for these various purposes and be used for those purposes as nearly as possible. The Tribal Council of the reservation has spent many, many hours in working and planning and studying to bring before this Congress the most efficient program possible. I hope that this Congress will see fit to go along with them and to help get them in shape, financially, and economically, and intellectually, so that they, too, may be able to get out from under the yoke of the Indian Department before too long.

Actually, the reservation itself receives no benefit whatever from the Missouri River Development Program. Actually, it takes from the reservation the best land, the winter protection for the livestock—the natural habitat of the Indian families—a great source of their revenue; it destroys their roads; their agency headquarters will be under 40 feet of water; it disrupts their homes, their schools, their churches, their hospitals; it disrupts their entire mode of living. Unless this program is approved, these people stand to suffer irreparable damage.

The Indians will be moved back up on to the open prairie without protection from the elements. Dams and cisterns will have to provide their water supply. Their way of life will be completely changed. If, however, this settlement program works out as the Indians and the subcommittee have set it up, these people will become established, part of them will be relocated off of the reservation and all of them will be placed in shape to handle their own affairs without supervision from the Indian Department in a period of possibly 10 or 15 years.

AMEND AND SUPPLEMENT THE RECLAMATION LAWS TO PROVIDE FOR FEDERAL COOPERATION IN NON-FEDERAL PROJECTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5301) to amend and supplement the reclamation laws to provide for Federal cooperation in non-

Federal projects, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in the 17 western reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.

Sec. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "construction" shall include rehabilitation and betterment.

(b) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

(c) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' association, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract with the United States under the Federal reclamation laws.

(d) The term "project" shall mean (i) any reclamation or irrigation undertaking or feature or unit of an undertaking, including incidental features thereof, having an estimated cost of not to exceed \$5 million, authorized by the Federal reclamation laws, or constructed by the United States pursuant to said laws, or in connection with which there is a repayment contract executed by the United States, pursuant to said laws, or any undertaking or feature or unit of an undertaking constructed or operated and maintained by the Secretary through the Bureau of Reclamation for the reclamation of arid lands or other purposes, and (ii) any similar undertaking or feature or unit of an undertaking having an estimated cost of not to exceed \$5 million proposed to be constructed by an organization.

(e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this act shall submit a proposal therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the proposal.

Sec. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail comparable to those included in preauthorization reports required for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been submitted for review by the State or States in which the project is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c), section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to the State or States in which the project is located; and shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities.

(b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this act such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall include all costs of ac-

quiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the contribution required of any applicant organization shall not be in excess of 25 percent of the costs of the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects, any existing irrigation facilities owned by the applicant organization may be pledged as all or part of any contribution so required.

(c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency, designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 5: *Provided*, That such contract shall not be executed until the expiration of 60 legislative days after the project proposal shall have been submitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and Senate, or, when Congress is not in session, until the expiration of 60 days after submission thereof to the chairman and ranking minority member of each such committee. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this act, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of 2 years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this act shall have been executed.

(d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation or drainage. All project works and facilities constructed under this act, except such portions that are dedicated to flood control or other functions which would in the case of a Federal reclamation project be considered nonreimbursable, shall remain under the jurisdiction and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the repayment contract.

Sec. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this act shall set out, among other things—

(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of the sums lent to it in not more than 50 years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available and, in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development, of interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at the average rate of interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant; and

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this act shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

Sec. 6. Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has heretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall be made in like manner as a proposal under section 4 of this act, but the Secretary may waive such requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of that section as he finds to be duplicative of, or rendered unnecessary or impossible by, action already taken by the United States. Upon approval of any such proposal by the Secretary he may negotiate and execute a contract which conforms, as nearly as may be, to the provisions of section 5 of this act.

Sec. 7. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this act, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existent engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. The cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the cost of making and administering any loan under this act shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5 of this act unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

Sec. 8. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this act.

Sec. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act. All such appropriations shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this act, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

Sec. 10. This act shall be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this bill. As a matter of fact, I support it, but I had hoped it would not come up under suspension of the rules. When the matter was before the committee, I offered an amendment which I think is very necessary to carry out the intent of this program and the purpose which is behind this particular legislation. That amendment had to do with providing a Federal grant of nonreimbursable funds to projects that had congressional authorization and were privately financed. To give you just a brief history of it, there are certain funds which are reimbursable when the Federal Government builds these projects, and there are certain funds which are nonreimbursable. Nonreimbursable funds include flood control and other items such as fish and wildlife. The amendment which I wanted to put into the bill, and which I think should be in the bill, is an amendment to provide that the Federal Government can make the grant of what would be nonreimbursable funds under Federal construction, provided the project could be privately financed. This would simply mean that the Federal Government could get out of the lending business on these particular projects, but such projects would not be penalized to the extent of nonreimbursable funds just because it was privately financed.

This bill provides a fund for small projects. I felt somewhat that it was discriminatory against Texas, because we do not have small projects down there.

If we want to get these projects financed by private funds, this bill could be made a step in the right direction with my amendment.

I had hoped to have the opportunity of offering the amendment so that there would be an opportunity to finance a number of projects much larger than the \$5 million projects already authorized but for which no Federal funds are presently available. I think it would be good for the economy, and I think it would be good for many sections of this country. Because it would permit people in these localities to finance their own projects.

There are several defects in this bill that I hope will be straightened out in the Senate. I had hoped, that the bill would be considered under an open rule so that these defects could be amended and so that proper amendments could be offered. I deeply regret the absence

of an opportunity to open the door for early commencement of construction on many authorized projects, especially the Canadian River Dam in the Panhandle of Texas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I was wondering whether under all the conditions it is exactly fair to expect the Senate to straighten out matters that we send over there.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I think that is a very good point, and if these bills could be considered under the regular rules of the House instead of suspensions we could straighten out the defects here.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Directing attention to page 12, subsection 12 (c) I read the following:

(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of the sums lent to it in not more than 50 years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available and, in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development, of interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at the average rate of interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The thing to which I direct attention particularly is the clause "when the principal benefits of the project first become available." That is the time that the Secretary determines when repayment should start. Is that the gentleman's interpretation?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is my understanding.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And that as the funds may be advanced when the Secretary determines that the benefit has come to the people who are interested in this project, that at that time they would start repaying interest on the amount that was advanced.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is my understanding. Remember, this is not my bill. As a matter of fact, as I said before, I would have enlarged upon it and changed several of its provisions. I am sure the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will be glad to answer the question and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is full repayment in 50 years with interest.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes; but the point is that in subsection (c) on page 12 there is the statement that "when the principal benefits of the project first becomes available." My question is: Is interest first charged on the money from the time it is put into the project or from the time the Secretary determines that the project first receives the principal benefits?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The experts on the staff tell me it is from the time it goes into the project.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. From the time it goes into the project and not from the time the Secretary determines that the principal benefits of the project have first become available?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In that case, the question of repayment or the plan for repayment is postponed until the Secretary determines the extent or the length of time in which the repayment should be made and the rate of interest?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No. Subsection (c) of section 5 states "a plan of repayment by the organization of the sums lent to it in not more than 50 years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available. The gentleman and I recognize that when any project starts you do not usually finish it within 1 year.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Here you probably will because they are small projects, some of them only involving \$50,000, and they might be completed within a very short time.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman does not want to leave the impression that the plan for repayment is determined and the interest starts running at the time the contract is entered into?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is correct. They start paying because they are short-term projects. These are small projects and the Secretary would very well find when the contractor started the interest would start. There is some detail that might have to be worked out in the Secretary's office. But they are small loan projects and that could very well be covered at that time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I want to make a correction. I think what the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] has in mind is whether the interest starts when the contract is entered into. The repayment, of course, does not start until the benefits begin to be derived from the project itself. In other words, you have a construction period there and the money is being used during that time, but you cannot begin repayment of it until you derive some benefits from it. But the interest runs from the time the contract is entered into.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I was wondering under the wording of this, as appears in subsection (c) which states "a plan of repayment by the organization of the sums lent to it in not more than 50 years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available."

As pointed out a moment ago, we know that these projects may take 1 year or 2 years to complete. When the plan for repayment is made, would the interest then start running? And if it took more than 1 year, would the people who have entered into the contract be required to pay the interest during that period of time or will they be permitted not to pay any part of the principal until they begin to get the benefits of it?

Mr. ASPINALL. In considering this part of the bill, we must keep in mind that there will be very few multi-purpose projects under this legislation. This legislation has most to do with the construction of irrigation facilities. In those projects there will be no interest-bearing money whatsoever. As I understand the bill, and as I understood it when we studied the matter, any place where there is interest-bearing money that fund will bear interest from the time it is loaned by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and their payments will start in accordance with the accepted plan that we use in all of these projects, when the benefits become available. I think that is all there is to it. It is a very minor point as far as this legislation is concerned.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman. It is important only as to features of a project other than irrigation features, that is, features that bear interest. The truth about it is when you are limited to \$5 million there is not much you can build other than an irrigation project, the moneys for which do not bear interest.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the position the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] finds himself in in relation to larger loaning power under this bill. The original bill called for \$1 million instead of \$5 million. He did offer an amendment to raise the limit to \$10 million. I am in sympathy with what he wants to do, but I think it might destroy the small project feature of the legislation. I believe he is in favor of this bill, although he would like to have included a much larger sum for loaning purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think we should advise our colleagues that we do have a definite authorization for funds in this bill and that it will be necessary to bring this matter back to Congress and its committees for a restudy in a certain length of time to see whether or not this program, which we believe to be so desirable, is working as it should work.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right. The bill has had some study for 2 years; this and similar legislation, and it is part of the President's program. The National Reclamation Association has worked hard to protect certain features, and we believe it is legislation in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, this legislation represents a milestone in reclamation history. This kind of a bill has been introduced year after year. I introduced a similar bill 4 years ago, but we did not think in the committee that we had the understanding of the problem to bring those bills to the floor. A small project bill has been recommended by the National Reclamation Association, and I think this kind of legislation has been recommended by every State association over the years. It makes available money for small projects that

have been impossible under the big programs that are carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation. In my State we have a water conservation board, and I believe, by use of this legislation, my State can go forward much faster than it has before in providing small projects. Our State has done better in that aspect, I think, than any other State in the Union. This is a great advance. It will mean a great deal to the people who want to build small projects and need minimum financing in order to help them to carry out their program. It is certainly good legislation, legislation that has been studied for years and finally brought here to the floor. I certainly hope that this bill will have the unanimous approval of this House, because it is the kind of legislation that will build small projects and cooperates with local and State interests in building these small projects.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] about three questions.

This proposal can be used for purely local projects; it has no necessary connection with any Federal project; is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. That is right.

Mr. HAGEN of California. This \$5 million ceiling applies to all features of the project, including the nonreimbursable? In other words, the \$5 million is an absolute ceiling on the total cost of the projects?

Mr. ENGLE. That is as I understand it.

Mr. HAGEN of California. It is not just the reimbursable feature that has the ceiling?

Mr. ENGLE. No. I understand the \$5 million is the absolute ceiling, and if I am wrong, I would ask my friends on the other side to correct me.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the \$5 million is all that can be loaned on one project for all the purposes for which it can be constructed.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Another question. In the definition of "contacting organization," you refer to water associations or similar associations having a capacity to contract with the United States. Now, I want to be sure that we are not creating a windfall here for some private stock mutual water company which is outside the definition of a public district. There has been some question whether or not a mutual water company, for example, can contract with the Bureau of Reclamation. Inasmuch as they are a purely profitmaking stock company, they should not be given authority to participate in this kind of program. But it is not clear under the definition, in my opinion.

Mr. ENGLE. My belief is that it would have to be a water users association which is in the nature of a public body, because only those have the capacity to contract the United States under the Federal reclamation law.

Mr. HAGEN of California. The gentleman would say definitely, then, that

this legislation does not authorize loans to a mutual water company that is a stock company?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It has to be a public agency organized under State laws in order to qualify.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Another question, if I may. Is there any language in this bill which would discourage local agencies themselves from engaging in power development, if it would relieve the burden of the cost of the project?

Mr. ENGLE. As I understand it, the gentleman has asked whether or not there was anything which would discourage a local agency from going into a power development if it would aid in the cost?

Mr. HAGEN of California. There is a statement in this report that power will be permitted only if it is incidental to the other features of the project. Here you are handing a plum to the local people, you are giving them low-cost capital; they might, for example, be contemplating a project to be built entirely with their own funds, a project involving a few generators, to reduce the cost. Now they come to the Federal Government because they get the money cheaper. But are we saying to them that if they come to the Federal Government they cannot build these generators?

Mr. ENGLE. We are not. If the gentleman can visualize a power project of any consequence that could be built for less than \$5 million, he knows something that I do not.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I know of no such projects.

Mr. ENGLE. Our idea is, if it is a power development, it would ordinarily cost more, and the funds available under this bill would then be available exclusively for the irrigation purposes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the House pass H. R. 5301?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS ON AUTHORIZED FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 9981) to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That irrigation distribution systems authorized to be constructed under the general provisions of the Federal reclamation laws may, in lieu of construction by the Secretary, be constructed by irrigation districts and other public agencies according to plans and specifications approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. To assist financially in the construction of the aforesaid local irrigation distribution systems by irrigation districts and other public agencies the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make funds available on a loan basis from moneys appropriated for the construction of such distribution systems to any irrigation district or similar public agency in an amount equal to the estimated construction cost of such systems, contingent upon a finding by the Secretary that the loan can be returned to the United States in accordance with the general repayment provisions of sections 2 (d) and 9 (d) of the Reclamation Project Act of August 4, 1939 (ch. 418, 54 Stat. 1187; 43 U. S. C. 485).

SEC. 3. Except as herein otherwise provided, the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, and acts amendatory thereto, are continued in full force and effect.

THE SPEAKER. Is a second demanded on the bill?

If not, the Chair will put the question.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAUD FLATS IRRIGATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5499) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats project for irrigation in the State of Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate the Michaud Flats project for irrigation in the State of Idaho substantially in accordance with the plans set forth in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation regional director of region 1, dated October 22, 1953, with such modifications as the Commissioner of Reclamation, with the approval of the Secretary, may find proper in order to provide for the most efficient accomplishment of all the purposes of such plans. Such construction, maintenance, and operation shall be in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) as far as such laws are not inconsistent with the provisions of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 2. The project's water users shall be required to assume an obligation to repay out of that part of the total construction cost of the project which the Secretary determines to be properly allocable to irrigation, so much as the Secretary finds to be within their ability to repay prior to the time when account being taken of the application of power revenues as provided in part (b) of this section, full return of the irrigation allocation is accomplished. Such repayment shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws as modified with respect to the Michaud Flats project by the following:

(a) Payments by the contracting organization shall be scheduled, under a contract conforming to the provisions of this act, on the basis of uniform charges for like classes of land in each unit of such project which will result in the establishment of annual installments which are, as nearly as practicable, of an amount equal to the ability of such water users to pay in each year having regard to the volume of production of such water users, prices they receive for their farm

products, and their production and living costs.

(b) Net power revenues received from the Palisades project, Idaho, and any developments combined therewith for payout purposes under the provisions of the second sentence of section 2 of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1083), shall, after payout of said projects is accomplished pursuant to law, be applied (concurrently with continued payments by the water users) to payment of the irrigation allocation of the Michaud Flats project until full repayment of said allocation is accomplished.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior shall require that a replacement reserve of an amount sufficient to meet replacement costs likely to be incurred before the end of the repayment period established under the provisions of part (a) above, shall be established and maintained in connection with such Michaud Flats project.

SEC. 3. (a) To aid in the development of not more than 21,000 acres of irrigable land in the Michaud division of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, as heretofore authorized by the act of February 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1061), and hereby reauthorized for construction, operation, and maintenance without regard to the provisions of said act, the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to reserve for the benefit of those lands when needed, but without prejudice to the interim use thereof for other purposes proper under reclamation laws, 83,900 acre-feet of storage capacity in Palisades Reservoir and 47,700 acre-feet of that portion of the storage capacity in American Falls Reservoir which was set aside for lands in the Michaud area generally by section 3 of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1083); and

(2) to account for the return of so much of the cost of said development (including the cost of the aforesaid storage space in Palisades and American Falls Reservoirs) as the Secretary finds cannot be repaid by the water users on terms substantially similar to those provided in section 2 of this act, except for the application of the provisions of the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564), and the act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1015, 1024), which are specifically made applicable to the project authorized by this section and Indian lands susceptible of irrigation under said project, by application of net power revenues of the Palisades project and any developments combined therewith for payout purposes under the provisions of the second sentence of section 2 of the act of September 30, 1950, after payout thereof is accomplished pursuant to law.

(b) Construction of works to serve the Michaud division lands shall be undertaken only if, in consideration thereof and of the additional benefits authorized in the preceding sentence of this section, such appropriate arrangements as may be required in the circumstances are first made, by contract or otherwise, with respect to a water supply for said lands which, among other things—

(1) limit that supply to the yield of the space in Palisades and American Falls Reservoirs as hereinbefore set forth and to that obtained by the pumping of ground water in an average annual amount of not more than twenty-two thousand and four hundred acre-feet; and

(2) consent to a priority in time and right in such beneficial consumptive uses of the waters of the Snake River, and its tributaries, as are established under the laws of the State of Idaho prior to the date of this act as against any use of the waters arising on or flowing through the Fort Hall Bottoms within the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, including, but not limited to, the intercepted flow of Ross Fork Creek, the Portneuf River below Pocatello, Big Jimmy Creek, Big Spring Creek, and Clear Creek, for the irrigation of the lands of the Michaud division of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

The United States consents to the making of the arrangements aforesaid, and its construction, operation, and maintenance of said works shall constitute a waiver of any of its rights to the use of waters arising on or flowing through the Fort Hall Bottoms, within the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, including, but not limited to, the intercepted flow of Ross Fork Creek, the Portneuf River below Pocatello, Big Jimmy Creek, Big Spring Creek, and Clear Creek, for the irrigation of the lands in the Michaud division of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

SEC. 4. The act of February 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1061), authorizing the development of the Michaud division of the Fort Hall irrigation project is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. In crediting the net power revenues from the Palisades project to the projects authorized in section 2 and 3 of this act, after payout of the Palisades project pursuant to law, said revenues shall be applied ratably to the two projects in proportion to the total construction costs thereof.

SEC. 6. (a) Except as provided in section 3 (b), nothing in this act shall affect any rights in and to the waters of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation or the Snake River and its tributaries.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the land tenure, allotment, or ownership on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$5,500,000 for construction of the works authorized in section 1 of this act, and \$5,500,000 for construction of the works authorized in section 3 of this act, plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the costs of construction of the types involved in these projects, as shown by engineering indices. There are also authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required for the operation and maintenance of said works.

THE SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

If not, the Chair will put the question.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, in the passage of the Michaud Flats project for irrigation in the State of Idaho, the House is fulfilling an obligation of the Government of the United States that has been pending for nearly 50 years. More than a half century ago the United States Government promised the Indians in Idaho that certain of their lands would be developed for irrigation. This project provides for that development.

Included also in this project is a provision to irrigate 11,035 acres of so-called white-owned lands adjacent to the Indian lands mentioned. When the American Falls Dam was built—some 27 years ago—the Michaud Flats was considered one of the best potential tracts of land in the State to irrigate and one of the most valuable after it was irrigated. Soil experts have stated that it is among the best and most fertile land

in the State. Subsequently an irrigation district was formed but due to the lack of water the land was never brought under cultivation. The settlers of this area have waited patiently upon the Government to provide for an allocation of water. This has now been done and there is no reason why this project should not be approved so that the development can go forward. It is an important project for Idaho and the United States. It is a good project and all cost to the Treasury under the law will be repaid. It is a pleasure to recommend this type of project to the House.

SALES OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FEED GRAINS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 563) relating to sales of Commodity Credit Corporation corn. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, or of any other law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized until March 1, 1955, to sell at the point of storage any feed grain owned by the Corporation at 10 percent above the current support price for the commodity.

Amend the title so as to read: "Relating to sales of Commodity Credit Corporation feed grains."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

If not, the Chair will put the question. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATOMIC ENERGY BILL, CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on H. R. 9757, the atomic energy bill, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ten Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Albert	Bentley	Bramblett
Angell	Bentsen	Buckley
Bailey	Boggs	Byrd
Barden	Bolling	Byrne, Pa.
Barrett	Bolton	Byrnes, Wis.
Battle	Frances P.	Canfield
Becker	Bosch	Carnahan
Bennett, Mich.	Bow	Chatham

[Roll No. 133]

Chenoweth	Hillelson	Perkins
Chudoff	Hillings	Phibbin
Clardy	Hoffman, Ill.	Pillon
Cooley	Holtzman	Powell
Cooper	Horan	Priest
Cotton	Howell	Prouty
Coudert	James	Radwan
Curtis, Mo.	Javits	Reed, N. Y.
Curtis, Nebr.	Jones, Mo.	Rees, Kans.
Dague	Kearney	Regan
Davis, Ga.	Kee	Rhodes, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, N. Y.	Richards
Deane	Kilburn	Riehlman
Delaney	King, Pa.	Roosevelt
Dempsey	Kluczynski	Sadlak
Derounian	Landrum	Saylor
Dies	Lantaff	Scherer
Dingell	Latham	Scrivner
Dodd	Lesinski	Secrest
Dolliver	Lucas	Seely-Brown
Donohue	Lyle	Shafer
Donovan	McConnell	Sheehan
Edmondson	McGregor	Short
Evins	McIntire	Sieminski
Fallon	McMillan	Staggers
Fenton	Machrowicz	Stauffer
Fino	Mailliard	Sutton
Fogarty	Martin	Taylor
Frazier	Mason	Thomas
Friedel	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, La.
Fulton	Miller, N. Y.	Tuck
Gamble	Mollohan	Van Pelt
Garmatz	Morano	Vinson
Gary	Morgan	Voroy
Granahan	Moss	Wainwright
Green	Moulder	Weichel
Gubser	Mumma	Westland
Hale	Murray	Wheeler
Haley	Neal	Wigglesworth
Hand	Nelson	Williams, N. J.
Harrison, Wyo.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wilson, Tex.
Hart	O'Brien, N. Y.	Withrow
Heys, Ohio	O'Neill	Wolcott
Hebert	Osmer	Yates
Hess	Patten	Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 271 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow for the Speaker to recognize a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 16 with an amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members I would like to inquire whether at that time we will have a printed bill and a printed report so that Members can study the report.

The SPEAKER. The report has been filed and will be printed tonight. The gentleman can have that tomorrow.

Mr. CELLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, in view of what was said, does that include the minority report also? The Chair spoke of the report.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it does.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman filed a minority report.

Mr. CELLER. It has been filed.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is included.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. There is a companion bill, H. R. 4975, with respect to which I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has talked with the minority members on the Committee on the Judiciary and has learned from them that there would be no objection to a

motion to suspend the rules and pass that bill also tomorrow.

The minority leader is temporarily out of the room, and of course if he should have objection later that would supersede anything that might be done.

Mr. Speaker, in view of that arrangement as I understand it, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on tomorrow for the Speaker to recognize a member of the Committee on the Judiciary to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 4975.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the bill?

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman will yield, in a word the bill is designed to obviate the necessity of having contempt citations approved in the House and subsequent indictments in the United States courts. It has as its purpose the taking of a recalcitrant witness to a United States court on a contempt proceeding.

Mr. CELLER. Do I understand correctly that if consent is granted that bill will be taken up tomorrow under a motion to suspend the rules?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 4975.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to pay a tribute to a very good friend and a former colleague of the House of Representatives, the late Hon. Harold Knutson, from the Sixth Congressional District of Minnesota. I want the RECORD to show that our former colleague passed away on the 21st of August 1953 in his home community of Wadena, Minn. He was 72 years old at the time of his death.

Representative Knutson served in Congress for 32 consecutive years as a Representative from Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District. His outstanding record of service as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and as a fellow Member gained for him the respect of all of his colleagues. He was a sturdy American of the Viking type. His record of service and legislation approved under his leadership are accomplishments that have been indelibly written into the legislative history of our country.

Born in Skien, Norway, October 20, 1880, Mr. Knutson came to this country in 1886 with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Christian Knutson. A rapid learner, the 6-year-old was able to speak English by the time the ship docked in the New York Harbor.

The family settled in Chicago, later moving to a farm near Clear Lake in

Sherburne County, Minn. Harold attended the elementary schools at Clear Lake and became a printing apprentice on the weekly Clear Lake Times.

The offer of a 50-cent weekly salary induced him to move on to the Royalton (Minn.) Banner. There Knutson slept in a small room over the shop and since the Banner owner was too poor to replace a broken window in the room, Knutson had to stuff a towel into the hole to keep the snow from blowing onto his bed.

Despite his humble beginning and meager salary, Knutson remained with the Banner until he ultimately became its owner. He later disposed of it to buy the Foley (Minn.) Independent. He published that paper until 1925 when he purchased the Wadena (Minn.) Pioneer-Journal, of which he continued as publisher until his death. In 1910 and 1911, while on a brief stint as associate editor of the St. Cloud Daily Journal-Press, Knutson served as president of the Northern Minnesota Editorial Association.

Mr. Knutson considered a reforestation bill, which he sponsored in 1928 with Senator Vandenberg, as his most lasting congressional accomplishment. He believed its provision for systematic tree planting in cut-over and burned-out forest areas would benefit the country for generations to come. He also worked for years for reduction of Government expenditures and lowering of taxes.

It is most appropriate to record the fact that during the last several months of his life, the late Congressman busied himself with plans to make available to the Evangelical Lutheran Church his summer estate at Manhattan Beach, Minn., to be used as a retreat for neglected, deprived, and handicapped children. This beautiful point, approximating 40 acres, stems out between two lakes and has the promise of becoming a tremendous project. This he asked to be dedicated as a memorial to his mother, Jeannette Holm Knutson.

Plans were made for a formal deeding service and a public reception of these properties on Sunday, August 23, 1953. But on the 12th of August, Knutson suffered a heart attack and, despite several rallies, he passed away on the 21st of August. It was his wish that the community would proceed with the deeding service even though he would not be numbered amongst the living.

The following is the prayer of Dr. M. A. Dahlen, executive secretary of the board of charities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church on the occasion of the deeding service:

Blessed God and Father in Heaven, we thank Thee that Thy Spirit has let and directed us unto this retreat in this hour.

We thank Thee that we can have a part in this pilgrimage, and be given the opportunity to be counted amongst the pioneers for the program and the project which Thou in Thy all wisdom can foresee in this place.

And then we would also want to thank Thee for that spirit and mind of Harold Knutson, who would want to evidence gratitude unto Thee for the blessings of a sainted mother, for the one who went into the very

valley of the shadows, if need be, to give him birth, at whose knees he prayed and learned to know of Thee and Thy Son, our Savior.

And even though for the moment we might be prone to ask why this beloved friend and benefactor could not be with us in this hour, may we look upon it all for the fact that, as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are your ways higher than our ways, and your thoughts than our thoughts.

Give unto us great visions and hopes for the Jeannette Holm Knutson Camp. Grant that our visions and hopes for this place may be in keeping with Thy will and way, and that these may soon unfold into reality, to Thy glory.

May we as members of Thy church be ever cognizant and mindful of the trust that we accept this day. Let this be a place of dedication, a place of thanksgiving, a place of rededication, where we receive high motives, and a charge and a challenge that shall go with us upon our pilgrim way.

Yea, let this be truly a Bethesda by the sea, that here as we look out upon the refreshing waters may also be dispensed the waters of life—a place of healing both to body and soul.

Hear us, O God, before Thy throne, in the blessed name of Jesus. Amen.

Mr. Sterling Knutson, of Wadena, Minn., a nephew of the Congressman, made the presentation address:

I wish Harold Knutson could be here to see this gathering who will carry on this work for him. This is the presentation of his own personal tribute to his beloved mother, Jeannette Holm Knutson.

It was his wish to grant the beautiful piece of property to the care and custody of the Lutheran Church, it to be used for the purposes of guidance and recreation of children who have been neglected.

During the childhood of Harold Knutson the family realized only the barest of life's necessities. There were few opportunities for recreation. The broken health of the father made hard work and long hours the daily routine for all of the family. It was during these days that the family longed for the opportunities that this development will make possible for underprivileged children.

Harold Knutson was a man of firm resolution. For many years it had been his desire to establish a tribute to his mother, whom he loved so much. The founding of this camp for these children is so typical of the things his mother taught him; to be generous and kind to those who needed help.

To those of us who were fortunate enough to know her, we could feel her love for little children. We saw how unselfish she was with her few possessions. Her smile was ready for everyone and her concern was for the comfort and well-being of her fellowmen. She was always generous with her sympathy and her well-worn Bible guided her in her many hours of grief. Her gentle philosophy put a song into the lives of all of those who knew her.

And now it is as it should be, her gentleness will be remembered with this memorial from her loving son. The children who have not been blessed with the opportunity to enjoy nature's scenic beauty can now do so here in one of the most beautiful spots in Minnesota. May God bless this memorial and the love that has made it possible.

It is with the deepest sincerity that I, as a direct descendant of Jeannette Holm Knutson, present this deed to the board of charities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. We in the family hope that it will be enjoyed in the manner for which it has been set aside by Harold Knutson.

Mr. Magnus I. Ronning, chairman of the board of charities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, accepted the deed to

the properties with the following remarks:

Dr. Dahlen, members and friends of the Knutson family, we are assembled here this afternoon on this beautiful country site and summer estate of the late Honorable Harold Knutson to carry out a program arranged by him just 2 weeks before his death. Little did any of us realize at that time that he himself would not be present to publicly greet you and to declare this parcel of ground to the Evangelical Lutheran Church for the purpose of erecting thereon a retreat for neglected, unfortunate, deprived, and handicapped children to be known as the Jeannette Holm Knutson Camp, named after his sainted mother who left this abode in May 1925.

It was Mr. Knutson's desire to perpetuate the family name in this place, which he loved so well, and to memorialize his mother who, together with her husband and children, pioneered in this area at the beginning of this century. Also that the benefactors of this camp should be the children and especially those who, because of circumstances in their lives, would be unable on their own resources to benefit from a camp of this kind.

In this very act Mr. Knutson joins the ranks of other kind-minded individuals who have gone to their eternal reward, leaving to his fellowmen a portion of his earthly possessions for a high and noble purpose. To carry out his plans he chose to use the facilities of his church, which he loved, to carry out a service to the generations to come.

On behalf of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, through its department of charities, I hereby accept in humble gratitude this property from the late and Honorable Harold Knutson under the terms of the agreement, transferring title of this property to the church for the purposes contained therein.

I desire to assure the Knutson family that we shall as a department of the church, begin to organize and lay plans for future development of this camp as a service to children. We shall ask the members of our church to support this project through gifts, in memoriams, legacies, and so forth and to place this project on the annual budget for financial support in order that the necessary expenses incidental to the operation of the camp may be met, also that the capital expenditures for improvements, new buildings, and the like may be carefully planned as the demands for this service become known.

To this end we pray that the Lord of the church will add His blessings in order that this service may grow and develop in His name and that the children who receive the benefits from this service may have a renewed faith in the glorious message of salvation through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

It is most appropriate that in connection with these remarks to the late Congressman that we weave in an echo from the memorial services at Wadena, Minn., as they were given by the Reverend M. A. Dahlen, who was so closely associated with him during the last several months of his earthly pilgrimage:

Friends of Harold Knutson, all: I speak for myself, and for the board of charities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as we all join the host of bereaved and mourn the loss of a devoted friend.

There is told of the incident from the time that the Brooklyn Bridge was built. During the building of it, the engineer was injured. For many long months, he was shut up in his room. His gifted wife shared his toils and carried his plans to the workmen. At last the bridge was completed.

The invalid architect was asked to see it. They put him upon a cot and carried him to the bridge. They placed him where he could see the magnificent structure in all its beauty. It was sad to see the one whose mind had conceived that wonderful structure lay there a cripple in such a manner. He asked to be carried here and there so he could see it all—the beams, the heavy cables, every strand. And when he had looked upon it all, he lay back, smiling, and said, "Just according to plans."

And so, we too are the product of the Eternal Creator. There is a plan and a purpose for our lives.

St. Augustine speaks of man as "but a particle of God's creation" and then he also brings out man's greatness in that he speaks of the fact that "God made us for Thyself." And in speaking of man again, he says, "Our heart is restless until it repose in Thee."

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, during the course of 32 years (1917-49), carries pages and pages of the acts and words of the Honorable Harold Knutson.

The June 18, 1941, issue carries a memorial address delivered by him a few days before and in it he quotes the words of the Master, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

In that address he makes mention of a famous agnostic who years ago had said that life is a narrow vale, between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. In other words, stated Knutson, the agnostic goes on to say that he saw life as a futile meandering through a desolate desert wilderness, surrounded on all sides by cold and bitter despair.

Knutson goes on to refute these words and says, "What a description to give to a triumphant adventure. What a mocking play on words. What a tragic lack of faith in the sublime promise of our Savior, Teacher, and Master."

Knutson further states, "The Christian religion has been assailed times without number, but none have been able to offer anything substantial or tangible in its place. It has been, is, and ever shall be the greatest known balm and source of comfort to mankind. It greets us at the cradle, sustains us throughout a troublous life, and its gentle and merciful ministrations enable us to face the end with hope, with courage, and with fortitude."

"To the sorrowing mother who grieves over the loss of her child, to the abandoned Magdalen who walks the streets, to the man who has lost his faith, to the wayward son who roams the earth, to the cynic who scoffs and doubts—to these and to all mankind the promises of the Saviour come as a solace in their hour of darkest despair. It is then one and all turn to Him for hope, peace, and comfort. There is, there can be no other outlet for our heart's desire. In Him rests the hope of mankind. Without that hope life would be a black void."

It was only last Saturday, when hundreds of people made a pilgrimage to the place of summer retreat and refreshment for Harold during the years, known as Dunworkin. The occasion—a public reception, a formal presentation and acceptance, that these properties had now been deeded to the Evangelical Lutheran Church to be used by its board of charities for a high purpose, and particularly mentioning, "a summer retreat for neglected, unfortunate, deprived, and handicapped children."

Mr. Knutson had for several months been planning for this project and looking forward to this day. This retreat is to be a memorial to his sainted mother, who went into the very valley of the shadows, if need be, to give him birth, at whose knees he prayed and where he learned to know of God and His Son,

our Saviour, and to be known as the Jeannette Holm Knutson Camp.

To use his own words as he spoke to Mrs. Henry Aslakson, wife of the summer caretaker, "Ja, vi maa bede meget for dette." Translated, "Yes, we must pray much for this." And we shall do that.

And we would also want to believe that this act with which he busied himself so much during the last months of his life "is just according to plan" and altogether pleasing to Him who can say, "Every beast of the forest is mine and the cattle upon a thousand hills." "Call upon me in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me."

And we would want to believe that with the other attainments and contributions in life—it was also for this, "that He came into the Kingdom."

If Harold Knutson had passed away while a Member of Congress, there would be printed and engraved for the annals of the Nation the details and the words of an occasion such as this, and bound and distributed widely.

It shall be my purpose as a citizen of the Commonwealth of Minnesota to ask one of the Minnesota delegation to Congress, when Congress reconvenes, to introduce remarks of this service and the acts of last Sunday, which had been planned by Harold Knutson and which was carried out to the letter with the exception that his nephew, Sterling Knutson of Wadena, made the presentation of the properties and accepted a flagpole from friends of the departed.

The wire recording of Sunday's services we hope to place in the archives of the Library of Congress as an inspiration and challenge to us all and to those who come after us. That act, which we witnessed last Sunday, we would want to believe has the blessing and the benediction of Him who hath said, "Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

Jeannette Holm Knutson, who was so deservingly memorialized by her son, was born September 23, 1848, in Skien, Norway. She was baptized and confirmed by Bishop Skor. August 28, 1878, she was united in marriage to Christian Knutson of Oslo, Norway. In the year 1885, they emigrated to America with their four children, the youngest a baby in arms. They came to Chicago, where they remained 3 years, moving thence to the Twin Cities and later to a farm near St. Cloud, Minn. Here, in a pioneer farm community, they shared the common lot of struggle and privation. They were ill prepared for such conditions. Their main resource were the intangible riches of industry and frugality, and the faith that God is the rewarder of those who diligently seek Him. She often thanked God for America. Here, alone, her family saga could have unfolded. There are only a few real satisfactions in life. Here in America, the Christian Knutson family found and won them all. After the death of her husband in 1913, she made her home with Congressman Harold Knutson, in Washington. When Congress was not in session, she made her home with her daughter, Mrs. Alfred Bredesen, and her son, Elmer Knutson. She died in Bricelyn, Minn., May 1925.

She is survived by the following children: Harold Knutson of Wadena, Minn., and Venice, Fla.; Mrs. Alfred Bredesen of Venice; and George Knutson of San Diego, Calif. A child, James, died in infancy. Her older son, Elmer, died in

1948. Mrs. Knutson is buried in St. Cloud, Minn.

The deep undertone of the life of Jeannette Holm Knutson, was her simple childlike faith in her Saviour. The worn Bible was never far away. Part of the song of her life was written in the minor key of want and privation, but all jarring discords gradually blended into the beautiful symphony of joy and gratitude to Him who justified her faith and fulfilled her dearest hopes.

It is very appropriate that the Jeannette Holm Knutson Camp for underprivileged children should be her memorial. She believed in the association of all who loved; in the service of all who suffer. May God bless her memorial and the love that made it possible.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, almost a year ago on August 21, 1953, the Honorable Harold Knutson passed away in Wadena, Minn. Mr. Knutson represented the Sixth District in Minnesota for 32 years.

During those years his name became almost a household word throughout the district because of his diligent service to the people. No task he was asked to perform was left unattended. The chores and errands of his district received his constant attention and he became a personal confidante to many people of the district during his years of service.

Upon taking office as his successor, he turned over to me many of the files and accumulated material he felt I would need to carry on the tradition of service he had begun.

He visited me in Washington to give me his personal good wishes and he thanked me for the fair and respectful campaign we had waged. This gracious act I regarded as an example of what is best in American politics. It is what Abraham Lincoln meant when he said, "With malice toward none, with charity for all."

This quality of forthrightness was known by many who respected him as a worthy opponent in the Halls of Congress and in the political debates of other years. Many Members of the opposition party, of which I became a Member, remember his friendship.

The story of Harold Knutson is another of the great American stories repeated a thousand times in our national history and yet always a refreshing symbol of the opportunity our country offers.

An immigrant boy born at Skein, Norway, came to this country at the age of 6, rose to prominence in our Government and for a third of a century is part of the exciting history of our country. He shared in the deliberations of a time when the United States grew rapidly and the world changed almost faster than men could fully realize.

But active as he was in the legislature of these times, he is best remembered for individual acts of kindness and service. He devoted his career to the worthy cause of his constituents—a service increasingly important at a time

when a growing Nation and an expanding Government became more distant to the citizen himself.

Members of Congress have always stood between the citizen and his government. Harold Knutson's record of personal service represents the best of this admirable tradition.

It is fitting that these remarks of mine be closed with the famous words of Longfellow:

Lives of great men oft remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.
Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable Harold Knutson, who for 32 years so ably represented the Sixth District of Minnesota in the House of Representatives.

I counted Harold Knutson as my friend. He was a unique personality. He was indeed a courageous defender of the principles in which he believed. He had built for himself a place of great influence and distinction in the Nation. He was grateful for the opportunities which America had afforded to him, and he made the most of them. As a poor boy, he demonstrated what America offers a man, of whatever origin, who practices industry and frugality and is determined to win against any and all adversities. He never forgot the struggles of his youth and was at all times ready to help those whose way was difficult. He was uncompromisingly patriotic and loyal to the institutions of freedom and democracy of his country and never deviated in the slightest from that deep love and affection which he had for America.

Harold Knutson was a newspaperman. At the age of 14 years he was apprenticed as a printer on the Clear Lake Times. Subsequently, during his lifetime, he became the owner of several newspapers and at the time of his death was the publisher of the Wadena Pioneer Journal, of Wadena, Minn.

A short time before his death he was interviewed by Dick Robertson and the article which Mr. Robertson wrote was printed in the Wadena Pioneer Journal under the caption "A Study in Conflicts—End of a Noble Tradition," which so well sets out many of the virtues and qualities of Harold Knutson. The article follows:

A STUDY IN CONFLICTS—END OF A NOBLE TRADITION

(By Dick Robertson)

About 6 weeks ago I remarked to Harold Knutson that I had begun a detailed study of his political career. We discussed it at some length and quibbled over interpretations. Before I left he had become enthused, almost eager to hear what conclusions I had drawn. I promised to set down a few observations for him when I had finished the research and requested that he comment on them. He agreed.

"Will you be critical?" he asked.

"You're a controversial man," I said.

"Will you be critical?" he repeated.

"Somewhat," I answered.

"Good," he said. "If there's anything I hate, it's unwarranted praise."

Five weeks later Harold Knutson was dead. What follow are some of the conclusions he might have liked to have seen.

In evaluating the life of Harold Knutson, it is well to establish from the start that this eccentric and outstanding man was a product of the American system, just as soybeans and corn are products of the American soil. And his critics, who in later years exceeded his supporters (vocally if not numerically) would do well to remember one elementary axiom: If they are to argue that democracy was badly served during his 32-year congressional reign, they are arguing essentially that democracy served itself badly, that the system is not self-sufficient, that it needs better leadership than it is able to provide, that the popular vote is a questionable device.

For his ascension to such phenomenal political strength as he enjoyed during the forties was a byproduct of an archaic seniority system (which he himself deplored) and a political magic which his enemies failed 16 consecutive times to conquer. His power at the ballot box, coupled with a Republican majority in the House, catapulted what Elmer Davis called a bush-league reactionary to national prominence.

It is significant that almost every one of the frontal attacks upon the Congressman over the years was cloaked in a substantial portion of secret, respectful affection. This was so because most of his adversaries saw in his powerful character many manifestations of themselves—those qualities they revered and those they abhorred. For the mental image of Harold Knutson took many forms, depending upon the internal composition of the viewer. But the picture was to each of them clear. He was in this respect, if in no other, like Harry S. Truman.

He has been variously portrayed as a villain and a saint—as a heartless manservant of privilege, a hard-bolled fighter for the common man, an arrogant exponent of outmoded isolationism, a vigorous spokesman in the good fight against foreign "isms," a mischievous guardian of oppressive wealth, a courageous champion of honest-to-Betsy Americanism. He once reflected on the fact that about the only label not pinned on him at one time or another was "militarist."

Actually, of course, both those who looked upon his portly frame as a shrine of unrestrained free enterprise and as an edifice to the underdog were wrong. Much of his political career was marked by a kind of zigzag operation in which he veered back and forth between extremes, so that he was sighted more often near the center than anywhere else. While his voting was characteristically ultraconservative, his nonlegislative self reflected an amazingly progressive sense of values. His dedication to the down and outer was as real as any liberal's. But his way of dealing with him was far, far away. The Congressman from Minnesota came up the hard way himself, and he was in no hurry to reform society; he belonged from the beginning to the haste makes waste political school, and few men ever have been prouder of a membership. As a general rule, he did not moderate or mediate conflict; he incorporated it within his own person, where opposing principles either struggled for mastery with one another or dwelled together harmoniously, each unaware of the other's opposition.

For Harold Knutson was not so much the average man as he was the national character in office. The national character always has been full of contradictions and conflicts. Mr. Knutson had most of them. He had both broad and narrow vision. He dreamed the dreams of Wendell Wilkie and also those of HOMER CAPEHART—dreams of a world united and dreams of a ward united.

Here was a man who could one day call the supporters of Eisenhower for the Presidency, America Lasters, and on another, praise their sagacity and patriotism. Here was a man who complacently allowed Thomas E. Dewey the Presidency in two successive campaigns, only to conclude that he was, when all is said and done, "a contemptible little shrimp." He reminded us of ourselves. And what was in his heart at the moment was what invariably found expression.

This sort of ambivalence was the source of his early strength in office and in the party. It was also the source of his subsequent weakness and his loss of prestige. For he was never a plodding partisan. He could please all factions at first because there was something of the philosophy of each in his own makeup. As the years passed by, he pleased fewer and fewer of them, since each had discovered that while he carried its banner in one hand, he clasped the enemy's in the other.

He was a kind of human battlefield. And in the vanguard of the beleaguering armies were the factions which had once pushed him to an authority he was reluctant to accept, and which had exploited his high position for their personal gain. Few of these retained the Knutson friendship, for mutiny, to him, was a cardinal crime, deserving of sustained scorn. And, like the Grand Old Party's elephant, he never forgot. As Harold Knutson boomed deceit and disloyalty, he applauded their antonyms. In his immovable scheme of things, there were but two categories of humanity—good and bad. To say that some might have stood on a vast middle ground was to cloud reality.

He was somehow able to mold the diverse elements of the sixth district into something almost unparalleled in modern politics—an entity which held firm in its allegiance to a major officeholder for a third of a century. It all started when he opposed our entry into World War I ("I cannot vote to put my country into war," said he, and the Main Street isolationists loved it.) For 32 tumultuous years, Harold Knutson's rigid finger rested steadily on the collective pulse of his constituents. On that fateful fall day in 1948 when the opposition garnered more support than Knutson had friends it was conceded that his finger had slipped. In his defeat he had realized more votes than he had at any previous election, but the opposition had a 3,000 majority in more than 123,000 votes cast. The patient switched doctors.

Public men are judged largely by their public words. The extraordinary rhetorical talents of Harold Knutson elevated him to a status he undoubtedly would not have attained without them. This newspaper, which served as the principal vehicle for their dissemination, was accorded a prominence normally reserved for papers hundreds of times larger. As its forthright editorialist became more and more obsessed with his role as a combination Cassandra and Nostradamus, the soul and the character of his medium grew as well. Most weekly newspapers are singularly lacking in punch, either high or low. Harold Knutson's paper, or at least his editorial page, never was burdened with that defect.

His editorial prose could hardly be described as elevating. Pungent, I would say, is the word. A man whose personality becomes more cantankerous with age is not likely to write more sweetly, and while "H. K.'s" style became more emotionally charged with passing years, it also became less and less redolent of orchids in the moonlight, for he was a dealer in published epithets and his trade-mark was black-on-white ridicule. He relished the distinction that resulted, for he knew that he was moving politicians and voters, if not mountains. Virtually every public figure of consequence in both parties felt the bite at least once.

But he saved his best shots for the New Dealers.

Harold Knutson liked to play it rough. When informed that Gov. G. Mennen Williams had dubbed him "the foremost remaining advocate of stone age financing," he shot back: "That young pinko doesn't know a balance sheet from a laundry ticket." And so it went. Every whim had its attendant bam.

For all his roster of acquaintances, Harold Knutson was basically a lonely man. He never married (he said he, like Mr. Dooley, knew about marriage the way an astronomer knows about the stars) and his circle of intimate friends was small. Those who knew him best are inclined to feel that this very loneliness was responsible for the self-centered intensity with which he tackled his job, the fervent passion with which he lived his life, for he drew the seething world within himself, where the unsuppressed turmoil raged and the victor determined the outward act.

Perhaps symbolic of the controversy which stormed within him was the choice of Matthew Arnold's Dover Beach as his favorite single literary work, for he often was depressed enough to share its dismal, prophetic picture:

"The world, which seems

To lie before us like a land of dreams,
So various, so beautiful, so new,
Hath really neither job, nor love, nor light,
Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain;
And we are here as on a darkling plain,
Swept with confused alarm of struggle and
of flight,

Where ignorant armies clash by night."

If we hear the times correctly, they call for strength of character and stoutness of spirit, for toughness of mind, for ringing and affirmative words, for dedication and consecration—for all those exalted and exalting things with which, traditionally, the great leaders have fortified the lead. The times call, in truth, for more political figures of the basically superior stature of Harold Knutson.

Some will say that our government deserves more humility and less dogmatism than men like Harold Knutson could provide. Some will say that to place the public confidence in such a provincial and stubborn man again would be to repeat a multiple error, the tragedy of which would mount as he stood still and the world rushed by. But no one acquainted with the life and times of Harold Knutson will minimize the desperate need for more of his massive devotion to duty, his unbridled courage, and his fierce, winning integrity.

Three weeks before Mr. Knutson died, he paid final editorial tribute to the man he admired most, the late Senator Robert A. Taft—"a man who was faithful and diligent in all things." The Sixth District and the Nation paused last week to honor another esteemed public servant of whom the same could be justly said—a man who crowded a rich and rewarding life to the end, a man who found more than casual comfort in the knowledge that he will not be forgotten so long as politics remains the most vital business in America.

In closing, I desire to pay final tribute to Harold Knutson as my friend—to a great American and a great legislator.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] in this tribute to our departed friend and former colleague, Harold Knutson, of Minnesota. I had the privilege of attending his funeral at Wa-

dena, Minn., and I extended to his family and relatives our sincere sympathy at that time. Minnesota lost a great leader when Harold Knutson passed away.

This fact was emphasized in an editorial published in the Evening Tribune, at Albert Lea, Minn., September 29, 1953. It follows:

STATE LOSES ABLE EDITOR

Minnesota lost one of its leading citizens and weekly newspaper publishers in the death of Harold Knutson, 72, of Wadena. He was always active in State and local politics and civic affairs.

Born in Norway, he came to this country as a small boy. After attending elementary schools at Clear Lake, Minn., he became a printing apprentice on the weekly Clear Lake Times. Then came the offer of a salary of 50 cents a week and he moved to the Royalton (Minn.) Banner.

He slept over the printing shop. Despite this humble beginning and meager salary Knutson remained with the Banner until he ultimately became its owner. He sold it later to buy the Foley (Minn.) Independent. He published this paper until 1925 when he purchased the Wadena Pioneer Journal of which he continued as publisher until his death.

Knutson, a Republican, was elected to Congress in 1917 and held that seat until 1949, when he was defeated by the present incumbent from the Sixth District, FRED MARSHALL. For a time in Congress he headed the House Ways and Means Committee.

Leaving behind him active politics, Knutson returned to Wadena and resumed the publishing business. He remained active until August 12, when he suffered the first of a series of heart attacks that resulted in his death.

Knutson, a bachelor, at one time was president of the Northern Minnesota Editorial Association. R. V.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I read of the death on August 21, 1953 of our former colleague, and my late valued friend, Harold Knutson of Minnesota.

For over 30 years Harold Knutson served with distinction in this body, a period that included the beginning and end of hostilities in both World Wars.

Harold Knutson was first elected to the Congress in 1916, and served continuously until 1948. At the end of his career in this body he was chairman of the all-important and powerful Ways and Means Committee, of which committee he had been a member for a number of years.

Harold Knutson was a man of strong convictions. His whole career evidenced this fact. He was also a strong party man, loyal to the Republican Party, of which he was a lifetime member, and of its policies and principles.

He was honest and forthright in his views, and was highly respected by those who did not always agree with him, whether Democrat or Republican, because they knew that Harold Knutson was not only honorable and trustworthy, but he was intellectually honest, voting as his judgment and conscience dictated.

In 1930, I was elected by my Democratic colleagues as a member of the

Ways and Means Committee, I served on that committee until 1940 when I was elected to and became majority leader of the House in Congress.

Although we were of opposite political parties, and our views on public questions differed frequently, a very close friendship developed between us and lasted until my friend's death.

I admired Harold Knutson for the fine qualities he possessed. Under what to some was sometimes a direct if not a brusque exterior, Harold Knutson had a sweet and lovable heart, and an understanding mind. Born abroad, as he was, he came to our shores with an intense love of America and its institutions and ideals, and gave of his ability, his time, his energy, and his courage in the strengthening of our beloved country.

For years Harold Knutson was a leader in the Republican Party. For years he was a leader in the national House of Representatives.

To him, friendship was a matter of paramount importance.

Harold Knutson was a man who could disagree without being disagreeable.

In life I valued greatly his friendship. In death I shall miss him very much.

The SPEAKER. Without objection all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the life and character of our late colleague, Hon. Harold Knutson.

There was no objection.

AMENDING TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "COPYRIGHTS"

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6616) to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights," as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 9. Authors or proprietors, entitled: aliens
"The author or proprietor of any work made the subject of copyright by this title, or his executors, administrators, or assigns, shall have copyright for such work under the conditions and for the terms specified in this title: *Provided, however,* That the copyright secured by this title shall extend to the work of an author or proprietor who is a citizen or subject of a foreign state or nation only under the conditions described in subsections (a), (b), or (c) below:

"(a) When an alien author or proprietor shall be domiciled within the United States at the time of the first publication of his work; or

"(b) When the foreign state or nation of which such author or proprietor is a citizen or subject grants, either by treaty, convention, agreement, or law, to citizens of the United States the benefit of copyright on substantially the same basis as to its own citizens, or copyright protection, substantially equal to the protection secured to such foreign author under this title or by treaty; or when such foreign state or nation is a party to an international agreement which provides for reciprocity in the granting of copyright, by the terms of which agreement the United States may, at its pleasure, become a party thereto.

"The existence of the reciprocal conditions aforesaid shall be determined by the President of the United States, by proclamation

made from time to time, as the purposes of this title may require: *Provided*, That whenever the President shall find that the authors, copyright owners, or proprietors of works first produced or published abroad and subject to copyright or to renewal of copyright under the laws of the United States, including works subject to ad interim copyright, are or may have been temporarily unable to comply with the conditions and formalities prescribed with respect to such works by the copyright laws of the United States, because of the disruption or suspension of facilities essential for such compliance, he may by proclamation grant such extension of time as he may deem appropriate for the fulfillment of such conditions or formalities by authors, copyright owners, or proprietors who are citizens of the United States or who are nationals of countries which accord substantially equal treatment in this respect to authors, copyright owners, or proprietors who are citizens of the United States: *Provided further*, That no liability shall attach under this title for lawful uses made or acts done prior to the effective date of such proclamation in connection with such works, or in respect to the continuance for 1 year subsequent to such date of any business undertaking or enterprise lawfully undertaken prior to such date involving expenditure or contractual obligation in connection with the exploitation, production, reproduction, circulation, or performance of any such work.

"The President may at any time terminate any proclamation authorized herein or any part thereof or suspend or extend its operation for such period or periods of time as in his judgment the interests of the United States may require.

"(c) When the Universal Copyright Convention, signed at Geneva on September 6, 1952, shall be in force between the United States of America and the foreign state or nation of which such author is a citizen or subject, or in which the work was first published. Any work to which copyright is extended pursuant to this subsection shall be exempt from the following provisions of this title: (1) The requirement in section 1 (e) that a foreign state or nation must grant to United States citizens mechanical reproduction rights similar to those specified therein; (2) the obligatory deposit requirements of the first sentence of section 13; (3) the provisions of sections 14, 16, 17, and 18; (4) the import prohibitions of section 107, to the extent that they are related to the manufacturing requirements of section 16; and (5) the requirements of sections 19 and 20: *Provided, however*, That such exemptions shall apply only if from the time of first publication all the copies of the work published with the authority of the author or other copyright proprietor shall bear the symbol © accompanied by the name of the copyright proprietor and the year of first publication placed in such manner and location as to give reasonable notice of claim of copyright.

"Upon the coming into force of the Universal Copyright Convention in a foreign state or nation as hereinbefore provided, every book or periodical of a citizen or subject thereof in which ad interim copyright was subsisting on the effective date of said coming into force shall have copyright for 28 years from the date of first publication abroad without the necessity of complying with the further formalities specified in section 23 of this title.

"The provisions of this subsection shall not be extended to works of an author who is a citizen of, or domiciled in the United States of America, regardless of place of first publication, or to works first published in the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 16 of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 16. Mechanical work to be done in United States.

"Of the printed book or periodical specified in section 5, subsections (a) and (b), of this title, except the original text of a book or periodical of foreign origin in a language or languages other than English, the text of all copies accorded protection under this title, except as below provided, shall be printed from type set within the limits of the United States, either by hand or by the aid of any kind of typesetting machine, or from plates made within the limits of the United States from type set therein, or, if the text be produced by lithographic process, or photoengraving process, then by a process wholly performed within the limits of the United States, and the printing of the text and binding of the said book shall be performed within the limits of the United States; which requirements shall extend also to the illustrations within a book consisting of printed text and illustrations produced by lithographic process, or photoengraving process, and also to separate lithographs or photoengravings, except where in either case the subjects represented are located in a foreign country and illustrate a scientific work or reproduce a work of art: *Provided, however*, That said requirements shall not apply to works in raised characters for the use of the blind, or to books or periodicals of foreign origin in a language or languages other than English, or to works printed or produced in the United States by any other process than those above specified in this section, or to copies of books or periodicals, first published abroad in the English language, imported into the United States within 5 years after first publication in a foreign state or nation up to the number of 1,500 copies of each such book or periodical if said copies shall contain notice of copyright in accordance with sections 10, 19, and 20 of this title and if ad interim copyright in said work shall have been obtained pursuant to section 22 of this title prior to the importation into the United States of any copy except those permitted by the provisions of section 107 of this title: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not affect the right of importation under the provisions of section 107 of this title."

SEC. 3. Section 19 of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 19. Notice; form

"The notice of copyright required by section 10 of this title shall consist either of the word 'Copyright', the abbreviation 'Copy', or the symbol ©, accompanied by the name of the copyright proprietor, and if the work be a printed literary, musical, or dramatic work, the notice shall include also the year in which the copyright was secured by publication. In the case, however, of copies of works specified in subsections (f) to (k), inclusive, of section 5 of this title, the notice may consist of the letter C enclosed within a circle, thus ©, accompanied by the initials, monogram, mark, or symbol of the copyright proprietor: *Provided*, That on some accessible portion of such copies or of the margin, back, permanent base, or pedestal, or of the substance on which such copies shall be mounted, his name shall appear. But in the case of works in which copyright was subsisting on July 1, 1909, the notice of copyright may be either in one of the forms prescribed herein or may consist of the following words: 'Entered according to act of Congress, in the year ____ by A. B., in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C., or, at his option, the word "Copyright," together with the year the copyright was entered and the name of the party by whom it was taken out; thus, "Copyright, 19—, by A. B."'

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect upon the coming into force of the Universal Copyright Convention in the United States of America.

Mr. CRUMPACKER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this not the same bill which bore my name in the last Congress?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is substantially the same, but there are differences.

Mr. CELLER. And the bill was reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary in the previous Congress?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It was reported out of the subcommittee but not out of the full committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

By unanimous consent, a second was considered as ordered.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would amend the copyright laws in all respects necessary for United States compliance with the International Copyright Convention.

The International Copyright Convention, which was negotiated in 1952 and ratified by the Senate a month or so ago, would enable American authors and composers to obtain better copyright protection around the world. Our copyright protection in foreign countries has been very seriously threatened in recent years. We have been obtaining it in the past through the back door approach of simultaneously publishing in Canada which gives us a protection of sorts with other members of the Berne Union to which Canada belongs.

Compliance with the International Copyright Convention cannot be effected until our copyright laws are amended to conform with the requirements of the convention. The amendments required relate to three requirements of the present law. The first has to do with the present requirement for the deposit of two copies of each book on which copyright protection is sought with the Library of Congress. This was a requirement put in the law many years ago to enable the Library of Congress to build up its catalog of books. I understand that insofar as works of foreign authors is concerned they not only do not desire this any longer but would prefer to have it removed because of shortage of space. Their problem now is more one of weeding out unnecessary books from their collection, rather than adding to it.

The second has to do with certain formalities of registration and notice which the copyright office likewise would be glad to have removed, insofar as foreign works are concerned.

The third and more controversial change has to do with the modification of the so-called manufacturing clause in the copyright law with respect to

works in the English language first published abroad in other countries adhering to this convention.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. After this legislation is passed is it not possible for English language books to be printed in England and be sent into this country without duty and at the expense of the American workmen engaged in the printing trades?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I may say first with respect to payment of duty, that that is not exactly the fact, for I understand there is a tariff on books, although it is a rather low one. This bill would not have any effect upon that.

As far as being at the expense of the American workmen engaged in the printing trades is concerned, I cannot agree with that. Testimony before the subcommittee was quite conclusive, in my opinion, in that regard. The American printing industry, because of the large-scale mechanization and mass-production methods used in this country and used only in this country, because of the fact that this is the world's largest market for printed matter, books are turned out in large runs in a way that is not possible in any other country. That is because of the mechanization that has taken place in this country. American book manufacturers and binders can produce large runs of 5,000 copies or over at considerably lower unit cost than can be done in England or any other foreign country. So far as runs of less than 5,000 copies are concerned, it is not economical to produce them in this country and they ordinarily do not. An ordinary run in this country will be a minimum of from 10,000 to 15,000 copies, and for such runs—in spite of the higher prevailing wage rate in this country—it is possible for American printers to produce them at a lower unit cost. As proof of that I would like to cite the Bible, which year in and year out is the largest selling book in this country. Except for a few special translations, it enjoys no copyright protection. It is not affected by the manufacturing clause at the present time. Notwithstanding that fact, 95 percent of all Bibles sold in this country are printed in this country. If it were possible to have them produced cheaper in England or anywhere else, it would be done. But it is not done; and that to me is the best indication necessary to show that the removal of this restriction, the limited removal involved in this bill, would not in any way jeopardize any jobs of American workmen.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did you have any testimony from the labor organizations concerning their thought as to whether or not it would interfere with American workmen?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes. We had testimony and I will say that the CIO favored enactment of this bill but the AFL printing trades unions opposed it. I may say that the Book Manufacturers Institute, which is a trade association for the book manufacturers of this country, favored enactment of the bill. If they do not feel there is any danger of

their suffering from foreign competition it seems odd that these employees should. I might say that a great deal of evidence on the subject was presented. A detailed economic analysis was presented by the Book Publishers Council indicating there was no reason to fear this competition from abroad. It seems to me that the position of the printers trades union was wholly unsupported by any substantial evidence and should not be persuasive.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. If we do not pass this legislation, does the gentleman not think there may be reprisals by the publishers of other countries which would react disastrously to our own book publishers who want to copyright the works of authors abroad under advantageous conditions?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; that is true. The Philippines is the largest single export market for American printed matter and they are considering such legislation. If we lose the Philippines market as a result of enactment of any such legislation it could have a serious effect on our own industry, and could result in the loss of a considerable number of jobs.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Is it not a fact that the United States has by treaty agreed to this whole program and that this legislation is merely to implement the terms and provisions of the treaty heretofore entered into?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is true. The treaty cannot become effective without the legislation and the legislation cannot become effective without the treaty.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of the following letter addressed to all the Members of the House from the city of New York by the Allied Printing Trades Council of Greater New York:

ALLIED PRINTING TRADES COUNCIL
OF GREATER NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., July 27, 1954.
To the Representatives in Congress From City
of New York.

GREETINGS: The printing trades workers of New York City, represented by the Allied Printing Trades Council, are very much concerned regarding S. 2559, H. R. 6616, and H. R. 6670, which deal with a change in the present copyright law.

We are of the honest opinion that this convention, and the legislation designed to implement it, discriminates against the American authors, publishers, and printing-trades workers, and we sincerely urge you to oppose these bills when they come before you.

We are sure that you are aware the proposals to eliminate the manufacturing clause have been condemned consistently by conventions of the American Federation of

Labor, and the Allied Printing Trades Councils.

Since ratification of this discriminatory copyright convention would affect the job opportunities of the American workers, our only hope for a fair deal is that you and other Members of Congress will defeat the bills proposing repeal of the manufacturing clause.

We earnestly solicit your cooperation in this very important and vital matter.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS F. DONATO,
Secretary.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL MOTORS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it might be interesting for me to say this afternoon that a few days ago a report appeared in the newspapers of the country which showed that the General Motors Corp. had a net profit over and above taxes and every other cost of over \$400 million in a half year and that this \$400 million profit in 6 months was \$100 million more profit than they made in the same period last year.

Interesting also is the fact that the Federal taxes of the General Motors Corp. has been reduced in the same period—that is, for a like period—\$300 million. If we will just contrast that, Mr. Speaker, we will see what is good for General Motors is good for the country, because in the great State of Pennsylvania there are thousands upon thousands of persons lined up to get food in order to sustain their families and their unemployed breadwinners.

Mr. Speaker, it may be good for General Motors, but I say it is not good for thousands upon thousands in many areas of the country who are lined up and getting free food in order to help sustain their families. I think the Members of Congress ought to know that.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I noticed in the morning paper that farm income has been steadily dropping and that the price of food to the consumers is still going up or retaining its position. Maybe that is part of the reason for the enormous profits to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is not good for the country. The farmer gets less money for what he produces and the city folks are paying just as much as they were. That is not good for the country, either.

VOTE ON ELECTION DAY

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, on this November 2, 1954, every Member of this great legislative body will be the subject of a yea or nay vote. Each American citizen who casts his or her vote by the use of the proverbial American secret ballot will have the choice of saying "yea" in approval of our records; or "nay" in disapproval thereof. This is as it should be. This is as it must always be in our beloved Nation.

I ask the time of this busy House this day because I feel it is imperative that you and I, as presently and duly elected representatives of the great American electorate, use our best and immediate endeavors in each of our respective congressional districts to have the largest possible number of American citizens do two things: First, to register in accordance with their respective State laws if they are not already registered and qualified to vote November 2; and, second, to go to the polls and vote on November 2. It appears crystal clear to me that you and I, as Members of the House of Representatives, should do everything within our power to emphasize and magnify the privilege of voting on November 2, and also the duty of voting.

For, certainly the right to vote is an American birthright. The 15th amendment to the United States Constitution, sections 1 and 2, provides as follows:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Our forefathers then set the standard of both the duty and privilege of every American citizen, and as clear as crystal they declared that no American citizen was to be eliminated from exercising the right to vote, and thus being denied the honor and privilege of voting "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Therefore, my distinguished colleagues, it behooves you and me as we return to the respective congressional district, which we have the honor and responsibility of now representing, to actively urge, and urge in practical terms and firm convincing voices, the proposition that each of our respective congressional districts shall clearly increase the percentage of voters who shall cast their ballots on November 2. Doing anything less than this, in my humble judgment, will not be doing our fullest duty by our individual selves and toward the strengthening of the citizenship participation in shaping the destiny of our great Nation.

Yes; the electorate at the polls materially helps shape the destiny of our

Nation. They do so by electing you or me, or defeating you or me. They literally do so by exercising their birthright. For, when a lad or lassie is born in these great United States he instantly has the birthright to exercise his or her elective franchise in accordance with article XV of our Constitution so soon as that infant becomes of voting age according to the law of the State wherein that child is born.

The cooperation which our great Library of Congress has furnished me in connection with my reading on this subject, properly to make these few remarks, shows that the voting percentage at the 1952 presidential election only exceeded the 1944 presidential voting average by 2.8 percent. As compared with the 1948 very low average of 52.1 percent, the percentage increase average was more than 10 percent. The Congressional Library factual report to me also tables the presidential election vote of November 4, 1952, for the United States as only 62.5 percent of the qualified electorate of 98,377,000 voters by only 61,551,919 casting their votes, while in Argentina, South America, at their election in November 1951 the percentage was 74.2; Australia in the election of September 1951 showed 95.6; Austria at its national election of February 1953, 96; Denmark in its national election September 1953, 80.3; France in its June 1951 elections with a qualified electorate of 24,973,148, 18,982,009 cast their votes, or 76; West Berlin in its December 1950 election made a percentage of electorate votes of 90.4; Great Britain in October 1951 elections, a percentage of 82.6; India in October 1951 and February 1952 elections, with qualified electorate of 174,470,000 cast over 107,000,000, or 61.6 percent; Mexico in the July 6, 1952, elections cast a percentage of 87.3; Spain in November 1951 a percentage of 85; Sweden in the election of September 1952 a percentage of 77. Compared with foreign countries then, the voters of the United States of America in the 1952 presidential elections rated 21st in percentages of the electorate that voted.

Of course, it is well known that the election laws in all these countries are not nearly uniform so that as a consequence the comparability of the voting averages of some foreign countries with those of the United States is open to question. And, of course, it may not be at all valid to make a strict comparison of voting percentages between that of any particular foreign country with that of any separate State of the United States. However, the accompanying figures should make us realize that, according to their own election laws, the voters in 24 foreign nations register and vote percentages far greater than we voters of the United States do.

When asking about the age group of Americans between 18 and 20 years of age, the Congressional Library informed me that there are no records available for any years of American citizens as to vote, excepting only as to the decennial census.

Let me quote for your most accurate information and guidance three paragraphs from the recent report to me on

this subject from the Congressional Library:

That the increase-decrease span in voting participation shows little relationship to regions is apparent from the data presented in table 2. Changes in voting percentages for the years 1940-44 ranged from a plus 15.2 percent increase in Maine to a decrease of minus 5.7 in Oregon. While the overall decrease in voting from 1944 to 1948 Presidential election was a minus 7.6 percent, the State of Nebraska showed a decrease of minus 17 percent. North Carolina, 1 of 8 States to show increased voting for 1948 had a plus 4.9 percent average. In 1952 every State showed an increased vote over that of 1948. Oregon, which had the greatest decrease in 1944, also had the greatest increase (plus 20.2 percent) in 1952. Colorado with plus 0.2 percent had the smallest increase in 1952 over 1948. Of the many important reasons for the 1952 upsurge in voting are the population increases and the concerted drives by numerous organizations to "get out the vote."

Congressional election voting changes show that Kentucky had the highest increase from 1942 to 1946, or plus 15.2 percent, and fell to the bottom with a minus 9.2 percent in the period 1946 to 1950. North Dakota was lowest in the period 1942-46 with a minus 7.9 percent and Oregon was highest in the period 1946-50 with plus 16.5 percent.

In all the elections, it is interesting to note that States of the South—Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina—have shown steady increases in voter participation despite the fact that none of these States have had more than 50 percent voter participation since 1940.

Why is it that so many millions of Americans are said to be indifferent or in a state of apathy toward exercising their constitutional privilege and American birthright? I do not claim to have the answer but I do declare that you and I, as honored and responsible political leaders in our respective congressional districts, should put on the armor of our respective official obligations and private citizenship duty in this regard and vigorously encourage our congressional constituents regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude to be sure to register before the legal registration date runs out—and then to be sure to vote November 2.

Manifestly, the records speak that the average American voter turns out for State and national elections in greater percentages than he does for local or municipal elections. And, this is truly an increasingly dangerous situation. For, it appears probable that the percentage of participants in local or municipal elections which participate at the ballot box is growing less and less. And, while you and I, as American Representatives in Congress, are only the subject of the ballot-box decision once every 2 years when so-called national elections are held, I submit to you that very likely the reason fewer and fewer American citizens do not even qualify to vote—let alone that they do not use their ballot box franchise—is because a smaller and smaller percentage exercise their ballot-box franchise in their own local and State elections.

My purpose in these several minutes is not to undertake to make a thorough analysis of the figures and percentages, but to merely call to your attention what I hope may be a helpful and constructive outline showing the general trend. But

in addition to that, my distinguished colleagues, I definitely urge to your immediate attention and your actual worries, the proposition that it is in the interest of our national security, and our national welfare, and the solidarity of purpose for our beloved Nation that the percentage of American voters actually going to the ballot box should sharply increase instead of dangerously decrease.

I am convinced that one definite contribution toward the reasonable probability of materially increasing the percentage of voters in our respective congressional districts who actually both register in time and then actually vote their ballot in increasing numbers, is that you and I as the duly elected representatives of all the people in our districts furnish frequent, positive positions of community leadership within our districts in all programs to get out the voters. We still have time to do it in practically every State. In California, for instance, the time for registration ends September 8, and several of you with whom I have spoken have told me that the period to register in your respective States does not end until September. So, my colleagues, let's spend some time and money too, to make the people in our congressional districts aware of their privilege and duty of registering to vote in time, and then simultaneously let us, you and I, spend time and money to perceptibly increase the percentage of voters who actually go to the polls and vote. No matter if some of the increased percentage does vote against us—that is not the most important thing. Rather, the most important thing is increasing the percentages of American adults having the consciousness of the fact that they and each of them in our respective congressional districts have a vote which actually has a tangible effect on the destiny of our Nation. This is what we need. This is one fact we need to get across to the people in our districts. I am not urging you to spend some of your own time and money in this regard until I first have spent some of my own time and my own money doing it myself. Therefore, I am not ashamed to urge you to practice what I am preaching and what I have already put into practice myself.

Before my last few words on this important subject, let me give you the figures for the United States every 2 years since 1940:

	Potential voters	Votes cast	Percentage voting
United States:			
1940.....	83,980,000	49,820,312	59.3
1942.....	83,606,000	28,074,364	33.6
1944.....	80,298,000	47,976,263	59.7
1946.....	90,245,000	34,412,224	38.1
1948.....	93,704,000	48,833,680	52.1
1950.....	97,416,365	40,429,556	41.5
1952.....	98,377,000	61,551,919	62.5

Can an American citizen possess anything more valuable than his inherent birthright to register and vote in accordance with his own informed, conscious convictions? Is there any more magnificent badge of freedom than his right to vote? What clearer way is there for every American citizen to have a voice

in his Government? If you and I want our fellow-citizens to increase in their loyalty and fealty to the American way of life as counterdistinct from false ideology, is there any better way for us to do it than to preach and practice in our own congressional districts that it is imperative to exercise their voting privileges? You and I both know that in our great Nation every man is actually equal to every other American citizen in the booth where he casts his ballot. Certainly each man's vote is counted exactly alike. Is it not true that in our own country the folks who elect us get the sort of Government which they deserve? Where is it in the processes of our beloved Nation that the people of the Nation control its destiny if it is not at the ballot box? Is it not at the ballot box where we as American people demonstrate our ability or lack of ability to govern ourselves? Is there any closer place to preserve our ballot box freedoms than in our congressional districts? While it has been truly said that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, is it not equally true that voting intelligently and eternally is also the price of liberty? I remember reading that Edmund Burke once said "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." So, it is that I desire to apply this pronouncement of this distinguished Britisher to this matter of voting and add to that the only thing necessary for losing our freedom, and to have it no longer true that ours is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, is that the people in our respective congressional districts who call themselves good citizens shall increasingly stay away from the ballot box.

So, my colleagues, let us go home. Let us each go home to our respective congressional districts vigilant and vigorous and determined to spend some of our own time and money and strength and intelligence and patriotism in our own respective congressional districts by actually seeing to it that the folks in our respective congressional districts do two things:

First. Register to vote before the legal time for them to do so expires.

Second. In every practical way promote the largest possible participation at the polls of the largest possible number of voters.

This is the American way for you and I as Representatives of the people of our respective congressional district to contribute strength, security and patriotic devotion to our beloved Nation. This is one way that you and I can help sink the false and crude and dishonest atheistic Communist philosophy. This is the way we can justly and proudly magnify the privileges of being Americans.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman has suggested that everybody who is qualified should vote. Has the gentleman any suggestions as to how they should vote?

Mr. DOYLE. No; I have not.

HOUSE MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of World War II in 1941, the largest single share of the Federal tax dollar has been spent for our military defenses and military aid to our allies in the free world.

Since 1946, between 33 percent and 72 percent of the total Federal expenditures have been for our national defense and for military aid to our allies.

Currently, military expenditures are running at a level of approximately 70 percent of our total expenditures.

Therefore, it is obvious that if any drastic cuts in overall Federal expenditures are to be made, most of these cuts will have to be made in military expenditures. Just as obvious, however, is the vital necessity that such cuts in military expenditures eliminate only excessive waste, extravagance, and inefficiency, and that such cuts do not impair the present or future strength of our Armed Forces.

During the 83d Congress I served as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, the House committee which is charged with the duty of studying the operation of government at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

During the 83d Congress, it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from New York, Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN.

The particular duty and responsibility of our Military Operations Subcommittee is to study the expenditure of Federal funds for military purposes, and to make recommendations to the Congress concerning measures which could be adopted to achieve more economy and efficiency in the field of military expenditures. Our subcommittee does not have specific legislative responsibility, but we have been granted extensive investigative authority, and our reports to the Congress have, I believe in all sincerity and modesty, been most helpful in remedying many situations where excessive and unnecessary military expenditures were formerly found.

I would like to take this opportunity, as the 83d Congress draws to a close, to present for the further information of the Members, a summary of the major activities of the Military Operations Subcommittee during this Congress.

The subcommittee has issued 11 intermediate reports to the Congress. These reports covered subcommittee activities ranging from investigations of specific programs, which pointed out irregularities in the business operations of the Government, to surveys of broad military programs.

In addition, the subcommittee has conducted several hearings in executive session concerning classified projects of the Department of Defense.

The subcommittee has been able to produce this great amount of work with, at most times, only 4 full-time professional staff members and 2 clerk-stenographers.

Some of the major accomplishments of the Military Operations Subcommittee are as follows:

SECOND INTERMEDIATE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 169)—RETENTION OF RHOADS GENERAL HOSPITAL AS A STANDBY ARMY FACILITY

The report on the retention of Rhoads General Hospital, Utica, N. Y., as a standby Army facility recommended that this hospital be retained. The subcommittee supported the Army's position in spite of some pressure to the contrary.

This hospital, which cost about \$5 million to build in World War II, could not be replaced for less than \$10 million in today's market. The subcommittee is convinced that had this facility been allowed to be demolished, it would not have been long before the Congress would have a request for the construction of a new hospital.

THIRD INTERMEDIATE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 857)—MILITARY SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

The subcommittee's report on military supply management served to assist the Secretary of Defense to promote several programs for better logistic and financial management.

While the subcommittee is reluctant to place a dollar value on the amount of savings resulting from its hearings and report, the Department of the Army announced this year that billions of dollars would eventually be saved as a result of new financial property accounting practices and inventory controls which are being instituted. The Army program which was strongly recommended by the subcommittee, is being designed to provide accounting tools by which modern businesslike fiscal controls can be applied to Army worldwide inventories. Early in 1954, the Under Secretary of the Army expressed his appreciation to the subcommittee for having assisted the Army in this connection, and added that "without it"—the subcommittee's assistance—"the benefits of these improved accounting methods could not have been accomplished."

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics recently recounted the progress made in supply management, and generously credited the subcommittee for its support of his programs.

FIFTH INTERMEDIATE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1051)—STUDY OF BUSINESS OPERATIONS IN THE DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENTS (PROCUREMENT)

The study of business operations in the Defense Establishment was a hard-hitting document containing case studies of ill-advised procurements.

The subcommittee discovered that the Department of the Army had procured \$45 million worth of poorly designed field-type Army overcoats with leggings attached. They were bought at a time when there were enough overcoats to outfit an army 3 or 4 times the existing strength. This exposure has contributed to pointing up the need for instituting better inventory controls and for extending stock funds to posts, camps, and stations.

This same report reveals a military purchase in 1951 and 1952 of more than 800 forklift trucks which today are, except for an extremely small number, not usable. Nearly all are reported to be in storage because no one wants them. This procurement cost the Government about \$3 million. The military departments involved have admitted to the subcommittee that this was a most unfortunate procurement. Steps are being taken to correct procurement procedures, particularly those with respect to preaward surveys. In addition, this report pointed up a basic weakness in procurement by single-service assignment.

Another part of this same report revealed that the Air Force purchased 142 miles of 9-foot expensive chain-link fence. Much is still unused. Some was even sent to bases which were not in existence. At a hearing subsequent to the subcommittee's issuance of its report, Brig. Gen. Fred J. Dau, Deputy Director of Supply and Services, Headquarters Air Materiel Command, Wright Field, United States Air Force, acknowledged publicly that this subcommittee's exposure revealed a loophole in Air Force inventory controls and accounting methods, and that corrective measures have been taken as a result of the subcommittee's hearings.

SIXTH INTERMEDIATE REPORT (HOUSE REPT. NO. 1196)—SURPLUS MILITARY PROPERTY, PART I

The report on surplus military property describes for the first time since the War Assets Administration days, the immediate and impending problem of huge stockpiles of surplus property. It has been estimated that there is as much as \$10 billion worth of surplus property in Government warehouses in the United States and overseas.

Last fall the subcommittee visited 10 military installations throughout the United States, making a first-hand observation of the character of this property, the type of personnel administering the sales, and the selling methods which were being used.

The subcommittee found that during fiscal year 1953, the Department of Defense had disposed of excess, surplus, and replacement property which originally cost the Government substantially more than \$1½ billion. A subcommittee study revealed that overall recovery on all sales of this property—excluding sales of scrap and waste materials—averaged 6.3 percent of the original acquisition cost.

This subcommittee has criticized this low return to the Government from the sales, which in the Air Force amounted to 2.19 percent.

Since it is estimated that more than \$2 billion worth of property will be sold during the next fiscal year, it is apparent that the Government gains \$20 million for each 1-percent increase in rate of return which can be brought about by congressional "watchdog" activities.

The subcommittee does know that as a result of its investigations in the surplus property field, the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the General Services Administration have undertaken intensive reviews of their

programs to determine how they might be improved.

EIGHTH INTERMEDIATE REPORT (H. REPT. 1216)—THE FEDERAL CATALOG PROGRAM

The subcommittee made a survey of the status, progress, and future plans for the completion of the Federal catalog program.

At present there are 14 major military supply systems, such as the Army Quartermaster Corps, the Navy's Ships Parts System, the Army engineers, the Air Force Supply System, and so forth. Each supply system names, describes, and numbers its items of supply independently of the other systems, although several systems stock identical items.

The objective of a single catalog system, therefore, is to provide a uniform language for the identification of items of supply within the Department of Defense—in order that one supply system will not be buying new material while another military supply system has large quantities of the same material rotting in warehouses or being sold as surplus, and so forth.

The subcommittee found that the Federal catalog program is sound in its objectives and that progress is being made in completing the cataloging, but that this progress had been painfully slow and that top officials in the military departments had given insufficient attention and priority to this most important program.

The subcommittee recommended that target dates for completion of various parts of the cataloging program be advanced considerably, inasmuch as many other long-needed changes in military supply management hinge upon completion of the cataloging project.

Only last week the subcommittee was most pleased to receive a report from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics stating that the target dates for completion of various parts of the cataloging program have now been so advanced.

TWELFTH INTERMEDIATE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1459)—ARMY BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF OVERCOATS

Further investigation of the Army's hasty and needless \$45 million procurement of an ill-considered new-type overcoat with leggings in 1946 revealed that in the 4 succeeding years the Army came before Congress requesting an additional approximate \$103 million for overcoats which it did not need and did not buy.

Apparently the money appropriated was spent for other items of "clothing and equipage," but the subcommittee hopes that monetary controls now being instituted by the Army will make possible a more accurate accounting for such funds spent in the future.

SEVENTEENTH INTERMEDIATE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1674)—MILITARY PROCUREMENT OF BLOOD SHIPPING CONTAINERS

The Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency, Brooklyn, N. Y., a joint agency which purchases medical supplies for all of the military departments, in June 1952 awarded contracts for the production of 33,750 insulated blood shipping containers at a total cost of over \$1 million to a small company in New Jersey—Bailey Engineering Co., Ramsey, N. J.—which had no previous

experience in the production of this particular type of container.

Thirty thousand of these containers were to have been procured for the Federal Civil Defense Agency to be stockpiled for use in the event of atomic attack.

The company went into bankruptcy after having produced only 18,000 of the containers.

Tests conducted by the National Bureau of Standards at the request of the subcommittee revealed that the containers would not hold the temperature of bottled blood at the required cool temperature for the required time.

The subcommittee has recommended that the Agency institute more effective means for analyzing the financial and production facilities of potential contractors prior to the award of contracts, and the case has been referred to the Department of Justice for further investigation of possible fraud aspects.

EIGHTEENTH INTERMEDIATE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1881)—NAVY PROCUREMENT OF WIPING CLOTHS

The subcommittee discovered that the Navy had been accepting shipments of subspecification wiping cloths from unscrupulous contractors for many years.

The Navy purchases approximately \$3 million worth of wiping cloths annually—for wiping down machinery and gun parts, for scrubbing, for soaking up oil, and so forth—and in samples inspected by the subcommittee, rejectionable materials furnished by contractors ranged as high as 88 percent in particular shipments.

As the result of the subcommittee's recommendations, Navy inspection procedures have been changed, and the Department of Justice has been requested to take appropriate action against the contractors involved.

TWENTY-SECOND INTERMEDIATE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2573)—AIR FORCE DEVELOPMENT AND PROCUREMENT OF AN/ARC-21 AIRBORNE RADIO TRANSCEIVERS

Last month the subcommittee held hearings and issued its report concerning the Air Force's development and procurement of an advanced design, long-range, airborne, radio transmitting and receiving set.

Since 1948, the Air Force has awarded contracts approximating \$100 million for these sets, and have incurred costs of approximately \$49 million under these contracts to date.

Between 700 and 800 of the 5,743 sets ordered have been delivered, and these have been found to be so unreliable as to be of no practical use in their present state. Presently, the Air Force is using substitute equipment.

The subcommittee has recommended that appropriate Defense Department officials review this particular development and production program in the Air Force, and decide what action should be taken to prevent further possible waste of funds.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Last week the subcommittee issued its report on the organization and adminis-

tration of the military's research and development programs.

This report was based upon 12 days of hearings during which the subcommittee received 1,500 pages of testimony from 20 principal witnesses, including top Defense and Military Department officials, military and civilian scientists working at military research and development installations, and distinguished representatives of the national scientific community such as Dr. Killian of MIT and Dr. Vannevar Bush of the Carnegie Institute of Washington.

The subcommittee's report noted several shortcomings in both the organization and administration of the military research and development program, and evidence of a deepening rift between the military officials and our vital civilian scientists.

The subcommittee hopes to see improvement in this most important program in the near future.

FOLLOWUP HEARINGS

Recently, the Military Operations Subcommittee conducted a hearing rather novel in congressional experience.

It is a commonly voiced criticism that congressional committees conduct investigations, issue reports, and then fail to follow up their reports to see that remedial action is taken.

Last week the subcommittee called in representatives from the Department of Defense and the three military departments, and reviewed all of the reports issued by the subcommittee during the 83d Congress to determine what action had been taken by military officials subsequent to the receipt of the reports, and to determine what further action will be necessary to correct the underlying faults in the future.

I think this is a most valuable and effective innovation.

FAMILY-TYPE FARM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying experiences I have had during the present session of the Congress has been the response to my address of June 23 in regard to the preservation of family-type agriculture.

The response has come from farmers, small-business men who have a growing realization of their dependence on the maintenance of family-type farming, and from agricultural economists in colleges and universities.

BENEFITS TO BE LIMITED

I urged in my address to the House that we adopt a limitation which will confine the benefits of farm price support programs and other farm aid to a reasonable family income, requiring those who exceed a family level of production to market their excess without Government support or subsidy.

Prof. John L. Fulmer, of Emory University's School of Business Administration, has written me:

I want you to know that I heartily endorse every word (of your address on Farm Programs and Family Farms). . . . You are perfectly correct in your assertion that re-

cent trends toward the large commercial farms hold serious dangers to farmers and to the country as a whole which depends on the conservation of farm population to preserve a balance in politics.

Professor Fulmer enclosed a paper which he delivered at the 20th annual meeting of the Southern Economic Association in New Orleans in 1950, discussing the effect of farm programs on southern agriculture, in which he found that "much public assistance in agriculture is designed and has the effect of giving to 'him that hath'."

Professor Fulmer quotes with approval from a study of Dr. Charles M. Hardin which found:

Thus, in the AAA (PMA) program, some 20 percent of the farmers get 60 percent of the payments. The Farm Credit Administration operates to provide favorable credit terms to commercial farmers. Marketing programs obviously favor the commercial farmers, especially those who, constituting a third of all farmers, supply some 80 percent of the commercial agricultural product.

Generally speaking, agricultural research and extension have most benefited those farmers already in better financial position than their neighbors.

E. E. Agger of the Department of Economics at Rutgers University writes that—

I read the speech with the greatest interest and complete sympathy.

He added:

For years I have contended that our American enterprise system grew up in an era of small business, and that unless we can maintain a large area within the economy for small business the system is doomed. And agriculture presents an even broader problem of far-reaching sociological significance. With that problem you have dealt in a most convincing manner in your speech.

FAVORABLE RESPONSE

I have been particularly pleased that farm people themselves across the Nation have responded, without exception, very favorably. I believe that a sampling of these letters is well worth the attention of Members of the House. They strongly support, in the moving language and experience of farm people themselves, the arguments which are advanced for fostering family-type agriculture.

Here is a letter from Moss, Mich., from Paul Siren:

It is heartening to know that someone is speaking for an old American way of life—to have a home, a few acres one can call one's own; a garden, a few fruit trees, and a few cows, chickens, pigs, etc., and in the evening sit on the porch and watch them grazing in the fields.

The trend is for Mr. Big to swallow Mr. Little Little and finally Mr. Little. I believe the trend should be reversed. That in order to be a farmer one need not be a millionaire.

There is the threat of communism if the land-hungry multitudes are to be serfs and peons. Let a man have a chance to have a home, a few acres, and a chance to make a living and he will not in despair embrace communism.

Again I thank you.

Mr. Albert N. Hume, of Brookings, S. Dak., has written me as follows:

I have read your address of June 23 in the House of Representatives about farm programs and the family farm. I am in agreement with your proposition in detail.

Am especially grateful for your statesman-like attitude in considering a vital issue in our national life. Frankly, it is encouraging to note that yourself and some others have courage and evident ability to render that standard of public service in this issue and others.

If it seems well to do so, please extend this appreciation to the honorable Congressmen from Illinois and Kansas who agreed with you. In these times of stress "keep the faith."

Alfred Gunderson, of Sturgeon Lake, Minn., writes:

I wish to render a hearty thanks for your address on the farm programs and the family farm. We appreciate your stand.

State Senator David F. James, from out in Montana, writes:

I have just read your address relative to the family-type farm. I think your thoughts are entirely correct and to the point. It is regrettable that legislation toward this end cannot be enacted, or can it?

Many of us out here are alarmed with the attitude of the Department of Agriculture acting in the role of trying to destroy our farm programs. I feel they will get a setback this fall when the votes are counted.

WONDERFUL LETTER FROM HOUSEWIFE

Finally, I want to read a splendid letter from Mrs. Roy Oeder, of Garfield, Minn., which deals in direct, human, and eloquent language with the problems of family-type farmers, their hopes and aspirations, their disappointments and their burdens.

Let me say that I appreciate such letters as Mrs. Oeder has written me immeasurably; that I have read and reread it, and several others of a similar nature, for they tell the story of the successes and failures of our democracy, of the bravery and fortitude of our citizens, in an individual, human frame of reference. Here in the Capital we deal in statistics and theories. A farm recession that dashes the hopes of a million farm families for a little comfort and a little surcease from bill collectors is translated into a curve on a piece of graph paper before it reaches us.

Mrs. Oeder's letter reverses that process and reveals simply and directly what the curve means to an individual American family struggling to raise a family in the wholesome, happy but character-building surroundings of a family farm:

I read your address, Farm Programs and the Family Farm, over once, and today I read it again. I want you to know that my morale was helped a great deal to know that there are people who understand the farm situation and are doing things to help us family farmers. We farmers aren't taken in by the talk that we are a burden on the taxpayers. I was born and raised in Minneapolis; my husband was raised in North Dakota on a farm. We understand the fact that what happens to small farmers has a great deal of bearing on what happens to cities and towns. Those people who are trying to get us so-called inefficient farmers off the land will send us into a farm depression, and in turn affect our economy, until we pull the cities down with us. I sometimes wonder what type of men they are. Has money become their god?

You were so right about corporation farming. If they want that type of farm, let them take their chances in the free market.

I listened to Billy Graham Sunday afternoon tell about juvenile delinquency. He's

been told it is almost out of hand. I have a little girl, age 5, and one of the reasons we have for sticking this thing out is the fact that it is such a good life for her. The kids here have fun, but they work, too. They are more satisfied and obey better.

We started farming in 1946 after my husband got out of the Army. Had the usual luck of a beginning farmer starting on a small capital. Bangs in our herd, well trouble, sickness, etc. We were beginning to see a little light on the horizon, when we were told there was too much surplus, etc. This farm had been rented for years, and my husband has taken the wornout land, and put it in good productive state. We have done what we could to the buildings, and had hoped to do more. Being without furnace in the cold climate, running water, bathroom, etc., we took it because we hoped for better things, but now it seems so hard to be without. It doesn't seem possible that here in these United States that a hard-working person can't have these things.

I wish you could see how the women around here work. You have no idea. They do their housework, plus a man's job, most of them. I have been ill, and being from the city, milking cows to me is something I just can't do. The women usually do that, when the men are in the field, but some do it all the time. They have chicken chores, big gardens, usually do all the decorating in the house, even carpenter work, because the men are usually too busy. Then they have their church work, take turns being leaders for 4-H, etc. Even with all this work, they seem ever so much more satisfied, than my city friends.

I'm going to ask you to do me a favor, please.

I would like to have you send your address to the people I will list on another sheet of paper. They will be in different occupations; both city and farm people.

I think your address was the best I've read, and I hope to read Mr. Shinner's paper too.

Written in all sincerity, that the future will be brighter than it looks to us right now.

Mrs. ROY OEDER.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MACK of Washington in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin.

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. BONIN

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. WALTER.

Mr. PRICE and to include additional matter.

Mr. MOULDER (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) in two instances and to include additional material.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include additional matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include additional matter.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota in three instances and to include additional matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances and to include additional matter.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WITHROW (at the request of Mr. O'KONSKI) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER in four instances and to include additional matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota), on account of illness in family, from July 29 to August 5, 1954.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH (at the request of Mr. HESELTON) for 2 days, on account of death in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3344. An act to amend the mineral leasing laws and the mining laws to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracks of the public lands, and for other purposes; and

S. 3683. An act to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 2, 1954, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7839. An act to aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 4, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1792. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Michaud Flats project, Idaho, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 485); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1793. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 29, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives adopted on June 24, 1953 (H. Doc. 486); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1794. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 24, 1954, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives,

adopted on September 27, 1951. The report is limited to consideration of the immediate need of modification of the entrance channel to Corpus Christi turning basin. A final report under this authority will be submitted at a later date (H. Doc. No. 487); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 2 illustrations.

1795. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 15, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on, and preliminary examinations and surveys of the Red River and tributaries, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana, made pursuant to several congressional authorizations listed in the report (H. Doc. No. 488); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 13 illustrations.

1796. A letter from the Secretary, Panama Canal Company, relative to a draft of a joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution authorizing and directing the performance of an agreement with the Republic of Panama regarding the relocation of the terminal facilities of the Panama Railroad in the city of Panama"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1797. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1798. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities relating to war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1799. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1800. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1801. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1802. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1803. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1804. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting new and

additional evidence in the case of Yam Lau, O300-390192, involving the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2605. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 16. An act to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees; with amendment (Rept. No. 2606). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GROSS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 361. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CRUMPACKER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6616. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 563. Joint resolution relating to sales of Commodity Credit Corporation corn; with amendment (Rept. No. 2609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8859. A bill to convey the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the city of Pawnee, Okla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9790. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1948, so as to extend for 5 additional years the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain public lands in Monroe County, Mich., held under color of title; with amendment (Rept. No. 2611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4975. A bill to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses; with amendment (Rept. No. 2612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 45. An act for the relief of Mrs. Merle Cappeller Weyel; with amendment (Rept. No. 2589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1308. An act for the relief of Leonard Hungerford; without amendment (Rept. No. 2590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1845. An act for the relief of Dr. Ian Yung-cheng Hu; without amendment (Rept. No. 2591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1904. An act for the relief of Otilie Theresa Workmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 2592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1959. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annemarie Namias; without amendment (Rept. No. 2593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2156. An act for the relief of John Enepekides, his wife, Anna, and his son, George; without amendment (Rept. No. 2594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2461. An act for the relief of Berta Hellmich; without amendment (Rept. No. 2595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2618. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2798. An act for the relief of Azizollah Azordegan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2958. An act for the relief of Ida Reissmuller and Johnny Damon Eugene Reissmuller; without amendment (Rept. No. 2598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1190. A bill for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek; with amendment (Rept. No. 2599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2030. A bill for the relief of Dr. Reuben Rapaport; without amendment (Rept. No. 2600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7362. A bill for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin; without amendment (Rept. No. 2601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7717. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn; with amendment (Rept. No. 2602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8261. A bill for the relief of Fay Jeannette Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8994. A bill for the relief of Harold C. Nelson and Dewey L. Young; without amendment (Rept. No. 2604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 10149. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities urgently needed because of overcrowding, and to encourage full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school construction needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 10150. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the city of Anchorage, Alaska, for recreational and other municipal purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 10151. A bill to authorize purchase of a portion of the bonds issued by the Brazos River Authority, an agency of the State of Texas, to finance the early development by it of the water resources of the Brazos River Basin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARLYLE:

H. R. 10152. A bill relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10153. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a \$1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10154. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a \$1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 10155. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands in the Benbrook Dam and Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 10156. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 10157. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10158. A bill to provide for the payment of fees to counsel assigned to represent indigent defendants in felony cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 10159. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a \$1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 10160. A bill to provide the highest degree of safety in the protection of the public interest and in accordance with proven operational experience and tested reliability; and to promote adequate, economical, and efficient air service by carriers, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:

H. R. Res. 580. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Con. Res. 267. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy relative to the contribution of atomic energy to medicine; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 695. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the Committee on Public Works on the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Res. 696. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President grant sovereignty to the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 10161. A bill for the relief of Harry Ling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 10162. A bill for the relief of Dr. Klaus Shawar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 10163. A bill for the relief of Miquel Ulloa Reynoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 10164. A bill for the relief of Clare F. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 10165. A bill for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 10166. A bill for the relief of Andrew Christopher Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 10167. A bill for the relief of Elpis Eleptheria Morelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 10168. A bill for the relief of Auguste Cuccoluto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10169. A bill for the relief of Christian Andresen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1127. By Mr. JONES of Alabama: Petition of Mrs. Travis A. Clark and others in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1128. By Mr. PHILBIN: Petition of Mary E. Luscombe of Fitchburg, Mass., and others in favor of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1129. Also, petition of Miss May O. Peterson of Fitchburg, Mass., and others, in favor of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1130. Also, petition of Minnie E. Macdonald, of Leominster, Mass., and others, in favor of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1131. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Norman Baker, Miami, Fla., relative to petition of impeachment of Thomas C. Trimble, justice of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas at Little Rock with accompanying documents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JULY 12, 1954.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive,

together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George L. Reid, Jr.	Clerk	\$5,823.00
John J. Heimbarger	Counsel	5,823.00
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	5,823.00
Mabel C. Downey	Assistant clerk	5,659.74
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	3,424.08
Alice Klotz	do.	3,089.40
Betty Prezioso	do.	2,631.42
Arlo Hill	Clerical aid	2,213.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....29,458.51

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....12,022.10

Total amount expended from June 11, 1953 to June 30, 1954.....41,480.61

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....8,519.39

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JULY — 1954.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	The clerk	\$5,823.00
Kenneth Sprankle	The assistant clerk	5,823.00
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk	3,882.00
Corbal D. Orescan	Assistant clerk	5,823.00
Robert E. Lambert	do.	5,823.00
Paul M. Wilson	do.	5,823.00
Ross P. Pope	do.	5,823.00
Jay B. Howe	do.	5,823.00
Samuel W. Crosby	do.	5,048.52
Robert P. Williams	do.	5,158.68
Carson W. Culp	do.	5,054.97
Robert M. Moyer	do.	4,951.29
Frank Sanders	do.	4,813.62
Robert L. Michaels	do.	3,941.88
G. Homer Skarin	do.	3,941.88
Lawrence C. Miller	Junior assistant clerk	3,145.26
Earl C. Silsby	do.	3,065.58
Francis G. Merrill	do.	2,667.30
Samuel R. Preston	Clerk-stenographer	2,428.32
Donald R. Bridges	do.	1,616.30
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	1,854.78
Willie Tarrant	Janitor-messenger	1,517.52
John C. Pugh	Consultant	1,216.14
Ralph W. Horton	Clerk to the majority	4,951.26
E. L. Eckloff	Clerk to the minority	4,951.26
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	Clerk-stenographer to the chairman	2,189.34
Delores Cropper	Clerk-stenographer to the ranking minority member	1,870.68
Donald G. Adams	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee	1,824.45
Nella L. Adams	do.	2,189.34
Charles C. Andersen	do.	2,189.34
Helen F. Baden	do.	2,189.34
Robert S. Bourbon	do.	364.89
Helen C. Chapin	do.	364.89
John G. Clevenger	do.	2,189.34
Robbieburr W. Courtney	do.	1,230.63
Audrey-Jo Dolan	do.	845.82
James W. Dudley	do.	2,189.34
Julia M. Elliott	do.	2,189.34
Mary S. Francis	do.	729.78
Theodora M. Grant	do.	2,189.34

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William Albert Jackson	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee.	\$1,094.67
Margaret D. Lane	do.	364.89
Jane T. Lumkin	do.	1,824.45
William J. Neary	do.	2,189.34
Esther N. Schweigert	do.	364.89
Margie H. Trew	do.	1,459.56
Phyllis N. Troy	do.	1,976.88
Mary A. Vaughan	do.	2,189.34
Dorothy Vitale	do.	2,189.34
Hilda C. Yeatman	do.	1,824.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$330,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 143,365.05
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954..... 145,784.63

Total amount expended from July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954..... 289,149.68
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954..... 40,850.32

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JULY 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harris H. Huston	Director of surveys and investigations.	\$5,823.00
George S. Green	Investigator	5,448.96
Rose Marie Wahler	Stenographer	2,253.06
Ethel P. Powers	do.	2,016.06
Dorothy Lillian Krueger	do.	790.96
Robert A. Collier	Consultant	659.75
Wilbur M. Cotton	do.	4,450.00
E. Z. Deadrich	do.	3,600.00
Harold J. DeVeau	do.	1,720.00
T. Howard Dolan	do.	4,122.05
Gerhard J. Drechsler	do.	3,204.10
Charles R. Fay	do.	800.00
Joseph B. Gromel	do.	4,350.00
Merrill M. Hammond	do.	4,586.20
George A. Horch	do.	3,200.00
John P. Kottcamp	do.	5,000.00
John F. Mahaney	do.	4,000.00
W. J. McWilliams	do.	3,350.00
William E. Morris	do.	2,820.77
George M. Norris	do.	2,250.00
Francis T. O'Donnell	do.	5,239.92
Arthur Olsen	do.	3,600.00
Thomas J. Quinn	do.	3,300.00
Walter C. Reich	do.	3,600.00
John W. Robinson	do.	3,720.44
Walter Schaefer	do.	5,850.00
James F. Tierney	do.	2,985.61
Charles H. Towns	do.	1,550.00
Alvin H. Weiss	do.	4,400.00
Robert W. Zehring	do.	5,592.45

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture: David A. Curry	Editorial assistant	\$622.52
Federal Power Commission: Roger W. Harman	Investigator	278.64

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Department of the Navy: Otho W. Helm	Clerk-stenographer	\$828.25
U. S. Information Agency: William A. Robey	Editorial assistant	726.15

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$450,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 27,552.50

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954..... 113,857.27

Total amount expended from July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954..... 141,409.77

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954..... 308,590.23

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JULY 2, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	\$5,823.00
John R. Blandford	Counsel	5,823.00
Charles F. Ducander	do.	5,823.00
Philip W. Kelleher	do.	5,823.00
Janice G. Angell	Clerical staff	2,810.70
L. Louise Ellis	do.	2,810.70
Elizabeth Gilmore	do.	1,139.89
Agnes H. Johnston	do.	3,065.58
Bernice Kalinowski	do.	2,810.70
H. Bailey Yeager	do.	40.53
John J. Courtney	Special counsel	5,823.00
James W. Birthright	Assistant special counsel	5,020.38
Edward T. Fogo	Investigator	4,467.42
Lloyd R. Kuhn	do.	3,734.76
Dorothy Britton	Secretary	2,348.64
Dorothea Clore	do.	2,268.96
Romer Kiess	Clerk	729.78
Adeline Tolerton	do.	936.55
	(Office of the special counsel operating under H. Res. 125 and H. R. 156, 83d Cong.)	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 53,187.95

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954..... 29,814.44

Total amount expended from Mar. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954..... 83,002.39
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954..... 66,997.61

DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JULY 14, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink	Technical staff director	\$5,823.00
John E. Barriere	Technical staff	5,823.00
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	5,823.00
Elsie L. Gould	Deputy clerk	4,322.04
Helen E. Long	Assistant clerk	3,145.26
Mary W. Layton	Stenographer	3,145.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures: None.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JULY 6, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	\$5,822.28
Wendell E. Cable	Assistant clerk	5,822.28
Ruth Butterworth	do.	3,607.29
Marie E. Herda	Assistant clerk (Jan. 1 to Apr. 30)	1,778.20
Wallace Schubert	Special employee (Jan. 1 to Feb. 28)	1,673.56
Margaret S. Rogers	Assistant clerk (appointed Apr. 12)	1,009.80
George R. Stewart	Professional staff	5,642.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$2,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 56.22

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954..... 199.86

Total amount expended from July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954..... 256.08

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954..... 1,743.92

SID SIMPSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JULY 19, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive,

together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John C. Graham.....	Staff director.....	\$5,823.00
Fred G. Hussey.....	Minority staff director.....	5,823.00
Edward A. McCabe.....	General counsel.....	5,823.00
Russell C. Derrickson.....	Chief investigator.....	5,823.00
John S. Hogland 2d.....	Assistant general counsel (to Apr. 30).....	3,882.00
Ben H. Johnson.....	Investigator.....	3,762.54
Jeanne E. Thomson.....	Assistant to the staff director.....	3,001.86
Kathryn Kivett.....	Assistant to the minority staff director.....	3,001.86
Helen M. McCarthy.....	Stenographer.....	2,985.96
Marion E. Sittler.....	do.....	2,985.96

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 116 AND H. RES. 543 (H. RES. 115)

L. M. Weltmer.....	Special counsel (began June 1, 1954).....	\$627.10
Myrtle S. Locher.....	Clerical assistant.....	1,791.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		12,697.10
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....		7,553.87
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....		20,250.97
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....		104,749.03

SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Jr.,

Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JULY 1, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford.....	Staff administrator and committee clerk.....	\$5,823.00
Sheldon Z. Kaplan.....	Staff consultant.....	5,823.00
Roy J. Bullock.....	do.....	5,823.00
Albert C. F. Westphal.....	do.....	5,823.00
Jane Nigh.....	Staff assistant.....	3,145.25
Winifred G. Osborne.....	do.....	3,384.23
Helen C. Mattas.....	do.....	3,145.25
Myrtle M. Melvin.....	do.....	3,145.25
Helen L. Hashagen.....	do.....	3,145.25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	18,885.22
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....	3,188.86

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....	22,074.08
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....	52,925.92

ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD,

Chairman.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JULY 8, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Helen M. Boyer.....	Staff director.....	\$5,734.73
J. Robert Brown.....	Research analyst.....	4,720.85
Elizabeth A. Buell.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,683.20
Patricia J. Burtner.....	do.....	2,335.36
Christine Ray Davis.....	Minority professional staff.....	5,400.58
Reuben S. Heppes.....	Clerk for research and coordination.....	2,643.40
Annabelle G. Moore.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,683.20
Martha C. Roland.....	Minority clerk.....	4,115.67
Clyde W. Smith.....	General counsel.....	5,823.00
Annabell Zue.....	Chief clerk.....	5,504.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for full committee and Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization expenditures.....\$100,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	48,860.73
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1954, inclusive.....	10,338.06
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....	59,198.79
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1954.....	40,801.21

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,

Chairman.

MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS)

JULY 13, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Michael P. Balwan.....	Staff director.....	\$5,400.60
Paul J. Cotter.....	Chief counsel.....	5,823.00
Robert T. Morris.....	Legal assistant-investigator.....	3,264.73
James F. Eckhart.....	Investigator.....	3,001.86
Walter R. Whitver, Jr.....	Investigator (effective May 1).....	1,141.36
Sylvia L. Swartzel.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,786.80
Mary L. Vaughan.....	do.....	2,468.11

REIMBURSABLE DETAILS

Stanley T. Fisher.....	Reimbursement to SEC for period Nov. 30, 1953 to Feb. 28, 1954.....	\$1,735.12
Carey Brewer.....	Reimbursement to Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress June 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....	502.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$115,425.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	48,040.00
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....	30,979.96
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1953, to Jan. 30, 1954.....	79,019.96
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....	36,405.04

R. WALTER RIEHLMAN,

Chairman.

INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JULY 8, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Maurice J. Mountain.....	Staff director.....	\$5,823.00
Edward C. Kennelly.....	Counsel.....	5,366.04
Walton Woods.....	Investigator.....	4,276.44
Arthur Perlman.....	do.....	4,276.44
Wallace Parks.....	do.....	3,611.28
Athena Gianakos.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	1,104.61
Chesley Prolean.....	do.....	2,348.64
Lois M. Knudson.....	do.....	1,812.69

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$118,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	46,223.22
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....	32,946.29

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....	79,169.51
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....	38,830.49

CHARLES B. BROWNSON,

Chairman.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JULY 1, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jane E. Morgan.....	Clerk.....	\$2,746.98
John A. Stacy.....	Investigator (Jan. 1 to Feb. 22).....	1,358.46
Ray Ward.....	Staff director.....	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$59,625.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	20,888.39
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....	11,076.01

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....	31,964.40
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1954.....	27,660.60

CECIL M. HARDEN,

Chairman.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JULY 24, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profes-

sion, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jack H. Bishop, Sr.	Investigator	\$3,118.90
Gerald Colevas	Clerk-stenographer	2,428.35
Stanley T. Fisher	Investigator	2,453.24
Elizabeth Frazer	Clerk	2,946.12
C. Niles Garrick	Investigator	4,246.02
Curtis E. Johnson	do	3,001.86
George H. Martin	do	3,051.34
Francis X. Plant	Assistant counsel	3,559.65
Nina M. Reed	Clerk-stenographer	975.18
Downey Rice	Special counsel	3,882.00
Arthur Toll	Investigator	4,246.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$117,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....37,818.18
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....46,417.63

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1953 to June 30, 1954.....84,235.81
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....32,764.19

GEORGE H. BENDER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JULY 1, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marjorie Savage	Clerk	\$5,735.32
Jack W. Watson	Assistant clerk	4,951.26
Lura Cannon	Assistant clerk	3,463.92
Loretta Livingston	Assistant clerk	1,998.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures: None.

K. M. LeCOMPTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JULY 7, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
R. S. Butler	Minerals consultant	\$4,951.26
Sidney L. McFarland	Engineering consultant (employed Jan. 4, 1954).	4,868.73

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George W. Abbott	Counsel	\$4,951.26
John L. Taylor	Territories consultant	4,951.26
Orland T. Huyek	Chief clerk	4,605.66
Nancy J. Arnold	Assistant chief clerk	4,093.92
Laura Ann Moran	Minority clerk	2,985.96
Patricia Ann Murray	Clerk	2,985.96
Eve Fatznick	do	2,667.30
Beryl L. Schaum	Clerk (employed Feb. 1, 1954).	2,222.75

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....7,597.08
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....8,187.44

Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....15,784.52
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....34,215.48

A. L. MILLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JULY 1, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	\$5,823.00
Kenneth J. Painter	1st assistant clerk	3,264.72
Herman C. Beasley	Assistant clerk-stenographer (from Jan. 3)	2,795.19
Georgia G. Gasmann	Assistant clerk-stenographer	2,826.63
Helen A. Griekis	do	2,826.60
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	2,189.34
Jessamine A. Falls	Assistant clerk-stenographer (from May 24 to June 19)	316.22
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	5,823.00
Arlin E. Stockburger	Aviation and engineering consultant	5,823.00
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	5,823.00
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$60,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....6,547.00
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....4,170.00

Total amount expended from Mar. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....10,717.00
Balance unexpended as of.....49,283.00

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JULY 15, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person em-

ployed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bessie M. Orcutt	Chief clerk	\$5,823.00
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant	5,823.00
William R. Foley	Committee counsel	5,823.00
Walter R. Lee	Legislative assistant	5,823.00
Malcolm McCartney	Committee counsel	5,823.00
Velma Smedley	Assistant chief clerk	5,823.00
Mary A. Ahern	Clerical staff (Jan. 1 to 15)	222.27
Violet T. Benn	Clerical staff	3,702.90
Anne J. Berger	do	3,702.90
Rebecca D. Bergesen	do	3,065.58
Lucille E. Brooks	do	3,702.90
Frances Christy	do	3,702.90
Mary DeMattes	Clerical staff (employed Jan. 16)	2,445.02
Helen Goldsmith	Clerical staff	3,702.90

1. Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and Revision of the Laws:

A. Preparation of new edition of United State Code (no year):
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1953.....\$121,616.01
Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1954.....61,791.45

Balance, June 30, 1954.....59,824.56

B. Revision of the Laws, 1954:
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1953.....7,877.00
Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1954.....7,650.21

Balance, June 30, 1954.....226.79

C. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1953.....13,504.69
Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1954.....0.00

Balance, June 30, 1954.....13,504.69

2. Funds pursuant to H. Res. 50 (H. Res. 66):
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1953.....27,372.52
Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1954.....7,624.42

Balance, June 30, 1954.....19,748.10

Employees pursuant to H. Res. 50 (H. Res. 66):
Orville R. Stewart, messenger.....1,257.66
Janet Romney, clerk (Jan. 11 to June 30).....2,142.90
Mary De Mattes, clerk (to Jan. 15).....222.27

Total.....3,622.83

CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JULY 6, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leonard P. Pliska	Chief clerk	\$5,124.06
Bernard J. Zinke	Counsel	5,823.00
John M. Drewry	Counsel (from Mar. 16)	3,396.74
Ruth M. Brookshire	Clerk	3,782.52
Vera A. Barker	Secretary (from Mar. 22)	1,467.01
Shirley Schwartz	Secretary (from May 1)	1,260.84
Frances P. Still	Minority clerk	3,782.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	18.45
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1954.....	1,960.68
Total amount expended from Aug. 3, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....	1,979.13
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....	48,020.87

THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
Acting Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE JULY 13, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederick C. Belen.....	Chief counsel.....	\$5,823.00
Charles E. Johnson.....	Counsel.....	5,435.16
Thomas C. Raum.....	Chief clerk.....	5,020.38
John B. Price.....	Staff assistant.....	3,463.92
Luey K. Daley.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,224.94
Lillian Hopkins.....	Secretary.....	2,820.60
Ann Gould.....	Stenographer.....	2,667.30
Evelyn K. Carson.....	do.....	2,348.64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	17,447.05
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....	15,247.97
Total amount expended from Feb. 18, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....	32,695.02
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....	17,304.98

EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS JULY 12, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from December 31, 1953, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert F. McConnell.....	Chief clerk and counsel.....	\$5,823.00
Charles G. Tierney.....	Counsel.....	5,823.00
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.....	Assistant clerk.....	5,823.00
Margaret R. Belter.....	Staff assistant.....	4,246.00
Violet Schumacher.....	do.....	4,246.00
Mildred Ames.....	do.....	2,587.62
Rosalie Stevens.....	Clerk-stenographer (Feb. 1 to Mar. 31).....	782.88
Dale Wade Blanton.....	Clerk-stenographer (Apr. 1 to June 30).....	1,174.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	17,560.03
Amount expended from Dec. 31, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....	2,315.13
Total amount expended from July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....	19,875.16
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....	10,124.84

GEO. A. DONDERO,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JULY 1, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jane W. Snader.....	Assistant clerk.....	\$4,246.02
Agnes R. Hanford.....	do.....	2,731.02
C. O. Haley.....	Minority clerk.....	3,463.92

LEO E. ALLEN,

Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JULY 12, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Dolores B. Anderson.....	Reporter.....	\$4,271.34
Donald T. Appell.....	Investigator.....	5,711.67
Thomas W. Beale, Sr.....	Chief clerk.....	5,823.00
Juliette P. Joray.....	Secretary to chief clerk.....	4,284.02
Robert L. Kunzig.....	Counsel.....	5,823.00
Rosella A. Purdy.....	Secretary to counsel.....	4,157.32
Raphael I. Nixon.....	Director of research (appointed to standing committee Mar. 1).....	3,882.00
Louis J. Russell.....	Chief investigator (terminated Feb. 28).....	1,941.00
Thelma I. Searce.....	Secretary to investigators.....	4,144.65
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.....	Counsel.....	5,823.00
Anne D. Turner.....	Chief of reference section.....	4,605.66
James A. Andrews.....	Investigator.....	4,525.02
Frank Bonora.....	do.....	3,264.72
John W. Carrington.....	Assistant to the clerk.....	3,463.92
George E. Cooper.....	Investigator.....	3,985.32
Annel Cunningham.....	Information analyst.....	2,720.38
Barbara H. Edelschein.....	Switchboard operator (appointed June 1).....	351.61
Earl Fuoss.....	Investigator.....	5,158.68
Dorothea Kell Hall.....	Clerk-typist (appointed June 14).....	214.29
Jennie R. Hayes.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,375.20
Lillian E. Howard.....	Research analyst.....	3,304.56
W. Jackson Jones.....	Investigator.....	4,467.42
Larry Kerley.....	Special investigator.....	1,870.68
Helen I. Mattson.....	Research analyst.....	3,463.92
C. E. McKillips.....	Investigator.....	4,458.06
Isabel B. Nagel.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,826.60
Lorraine Nichols.....	do.....	2,866.44
Raphael I. Nixon.....	Director of research (appointed to standing committee Mar. 1).....	1,941.00

Courtney E. Owens.....	Acting chief investigator.....	5,296.92
Asselia S. Poore.....	Editor.....	3,410.80
Carolyn G. Roberts.....	Assistant chief of reference section.....	3,517.00
Rose M. Sanko.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,959.38
Leslie C. Scott.....	Research analyst.....	3,463.92
Josephine Sheetz.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,215.86

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Majorie Sirlouis.....	Secretary to counsel (appointed May 17).....	\$729.90
Gladys Slack.....	Information analyst.....	2,746.94
Riley D. Smith, Jr.....	Stock clerk.....	2,348.66
Alvin W. Stokes.....	Investigator.....	3,463.92
Ruth K. Tansill.....	Information analyst.....	2,853.18
Margaret Thomas.....	Clerk-typist (terminated Apr. 1).....	935.34
Billie Wheeler.....	Clerk-stenographer (Apr. 1 to 30; June 1 to 30).....	942.20
William A. Wheeler.....	Investigator.....	5,573.40
George C. Williams.....	do.....	4,460.17
Kathryn E. Zimmerman.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,853.18

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$575,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	267,932.76
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....	142,126.82
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....	410,059.58
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1954.....	164,940.42

HAROLD H. VELDE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JULY 6, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Karl Standish.....	Chief clerk.....	\$5,823.00
Casey M. Jones.....	Professional aid.....	5,823.00
Harold A. L. Lawrence.....	do.....	5,823.00
Oliver E. Meadows.....	do.....	5,823.00
Edwin B. Patterson.....	Counsel.....	5,823.00
Paul K. Jones.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,951.26
Alice V. Matthews.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,048.65
Frances Montanye.....	do.....	3,048.65
Ida Rowan.....	Administrative assistant.....	5,823.00
George J. Turner.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,185.07
Helen Wright.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,826.60

¹ Paid from special funds authorized to the committee for an inspection of the Veterans' Administration (H. Res. 34, approved Mar. 4, 1953).

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	10,547.27
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....	6,077.02
Total amount expended from Mar. 5, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....	16,624.29
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....	33,375.71

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JUNE 30, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profes-

sion, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Russell E. Train	Clerk (C)	\$5,823.00
Thomas A. Martin	Professional assistant (P)	5,158.68
Richard M. Furlaud	do	5,538.87
Karl T. Schlotterbeck	do	5,823.00
Leo H. Irwin	Minority adviser (P)	5,823.00
Susan Alice Taylor	Staff assistant	3,671.01
Frances C. Russell	do	3,623.22
June A. Kendall	do	3,029.76
Anne Gorden	do	3,005.85
Virginia M. Butler	do	3,005.85
Grace Good	Staff assistant (from June 1)	517.57
Irene Wade	do	463.13
Hughlon Greene	Messenger	1,934.40
Walter B. Little	do	1,934.40

DANIEL A. REED,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS
JULY 3, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carl E. Davis	Staff director	\$4,423.84
David E. White	Chief investigator	3,862.20
L. V. Monzel	Research analyst	3,782.55
Melvin M. Miller	Counsel	2,746.95
Richard L. Griffith	Investigator	1,558.90
Jane M. Deem	Clerk	3,065.58
Elizabeth H. Feltman	Clerical assistant	2,825.60
Elva W. Bell	do	2,667.30
Virginia Hell	do	2,519.11

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$135,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....61,357.84

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....31,285.05

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....92,642.89

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....42,357.11

WILLIAM S. HILL,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS
JULY 15, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profes-

sion, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Casey, Kathryn	Legal analyst	\$3,611.28
De Huszar, George B.	Special expert	2,008.95
Dodd, Norman	Research director	5,573.40
Ettinger, Karl E.	Research assistant	2,100.18
Koch, Arnold T.	Associate counsel	5,037.66
Kuhns, William C.	Research assistant	2,051.33
Lake, Elyn	do	2,268.99
Lauren, Lee D.	do	4,151.82
Loneragan, Lucy W.	do	2,826.60
McNiece, Thomas M.	Assistant research director	4,501.98
Marshall, John, Jr.	Chief clerk	3,017.82
Miller, Carolyn A.	Assistant clerk	2,472.56
Pickett, Virginia	do	2,356.62
Wormser, Rene A.	General counsel	5,823.00
Cox, Mildred	Assistant clerk	2,089.98
Van Wyck, Kathleen	Research assistant	230.87
Deakins, Mabel R.	Secretary	1,353.43
Corbin, Mary	Typist	628.44
Wesson, Jane	Assistant clerk	654.72
Kent, Elizabeth	do	348.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$115,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....25,587.53

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954.....63,506.33

Total amount expended from Sept. 15, 1953, to June 30, 1954.....89,093.89

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954.....25,906.11

B. CARROLL REECE,
Chairman.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

An Amendment to Article V of the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 26 the highly respected gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and I introduced House Joint Resolutions 568 and 569, respectively.

The resolutions are identical. They propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide procedure for proposing amendments to the Constitution by the States and to make secure in the States their power to amend the Constitution.

The remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] made in connection with the introduction of House Joint Resolution 568, appear in the RECORD of that date on page 11484, and include an explanation of the new procedure for the proposal of amendments by the States and the text of the amendment. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to add brief observations.

As was pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], it was not in-

tended that these resolutions be acted upon by this Congress as they will again be introduced in the early part of the 1st session of the 84th Congress. Meanwhile, the proposed amendment may be studied by the Members, as also by the members of the State legislatures and the attorneys general of the several States, by State and national bar associations and citizens organizations, and by the people generally.

It is the desire of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] and myself, that the resolutions be regarded as a joint introduction as, if House rules had permitted, we would have joined in the introduction of a single resolution. The purpose of having the introduction so regarded is to establish for the legislative course of this amendment its fundamental nonpartisan character, and to recognize and preserve its nonpartisan origin later mentioned in my remarks.

Research during recent years appears to disclose that the practical operation of the power of the States to propose amendments may have been rendered uncertain as an indirect result of judicial decisions in other areas and changes in legal aspects occurring over the years since the adoption of the Constitution. This development has been gradual and generally unobserved. It is not the time in the closing days of the Congress to enlarge into a discussion of this, which can better be done during the 84th Congress when the resolutions are being considered.

The proposed amendment is designed to overcome such adverse effect by providing clear procedure for the proposal of amendments by the States.

The development mentioned has been brought to attention by the Committee for the Preservation of State and Local Government, a nonpartisan, nonprofit, citizens' educational organization incorporated under the laws of Illinois, with offices at 332 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago 4, Ill.

Author of the proposed amendment is John B. Ebinger, Esq., of Klamath Falls, Oreg., a member of the Oregon bar and a former member of its board of governors, whose original research was made some years ago and who, in January 1953, formed the above-named organization and is its executive director. He is referred to by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, as "an Oregon attorney of substance, who has developed an amendment to the Constitution which seems to me to have real value."

It is appropriate to note that in their 1953 sessions the legislatures of three States have already considered and adopted resolutions looking toward this amendment, namely, South Dakota, Illinois, and Alabama, in the order named.

It is hoped that throughout the process of the proposal and ratification of this amendment it may be kept free from partisan politics so that all who will may

support this basic amendment, irrespective of political affiliation and regardless of party lines, to the end that State position may be reestablished in line with the intention of the founders, so that the States may, by constitutional amendment, if necessary, protect the reservation of power under the 10th article of the Bill of Rights, by which, and, I believe, only by which, the union of sovereign States may survive, and the local controls of government that are traditional to the American people can be made to endure.

As it may serve the convenience of the Members, as well as the public who may be interested in these resolutions, I include as part of my remarks the text of House Joint Resolution 569:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of article V of the Constitution of the United States, the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments; or the legislature of any State, whenever two-thirds of each house shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to this Constitution by transmitting to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretary of state of each of the several States a certified copy of the resolution proposing the amendment, which shall be deemed submitted to the several States for ratification when certified copies of resolutions of the legislatures of any 12 of the several States by two-thirds of each house shall have been so transmitted concurring in the proposal of such amendment; which, in any case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

"Sec. 2. The act of proposal, concurrence in a proposal, or ratification of an amendment, shall not be revocable.

"Sec. 3. A proposal of an amendment by a State shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so concurred in within 7 years from the date of the proposal. A proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so ratified within 15 years from the date of its submission, or shorter period as may be prescribed in the resolution proposing the amendment.

"Sec. 4. Controversies respecting the validity of an amendment shall be justiciable and shall be determined by the exercise of the judicial power of the United States."

Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

Need for Mental Hospital at Newington, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks an increasing number of complaints has come to my attention concerning the lack of neuropsychiatric facilities for the treatment of veterans, not only in my district, but throughout the whole State of Connecticut. Not a weekend passes that pleas are not made to me for assistance to mentally ill veterans. I am greatly concerned as the number of these requests increases and there is no concrete evidence that conditions will be alleviated in the near future.

The need for more facilities to care for the mentally ill in the area is not in dispute. With little cost, existing facilities of a veterans' hospital can be made available. To fail to do so is an economic waste, and in the presence of the human hardship and suffering involved, would shock the conscience of our people.

I am bringing this to the attention of the House membership, and especially to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, because the situation that exists in Connecticut is opposed to ordinary commonsense. This hospital, located at Newington, Conn., is in danger of being declared surplus and, as a result, would lose its identity as a veterans' hospital, in spite of the obvious need for additional facilities to care for mentally ill veterans within the State.

At this session of Congress, I introduced a joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 299—directing the Veterans' Administration to survey and study the 300-bed veterans' hospital at Newington to find if it is possible to convert this establishment for use as a neuropsychiatric facility. At the present time, 40 of the 300 beds are in use for the treatment of mentally ill veterans. I am reliably informed that only about half of the remaining beds are in use for medical and surgical cases.

During the first half of this year, there were 640 mentally ill veterans from my State being treated in veterans' hospitals outside of Connecticut. In addition, 773 veterans were being treated in State hospitals and 8 in private institutions. This is a total of 1,421 Connecticut veterans unable to be placed in veterans' facilities within the State where they reside. That the problem is growing is shown by the fact that last year, at this time, the total was 1,008. Medical authorities confirm what our own good sense tells us—that treatment of a mentally ill patient is helped and accelerated if he is located in an institution close to his home and is visited frequently by members of his family.

The new veterans' hospital at West Haven, Conn., opened last year, is equipped only to handle emergency

mental cases and then only on a temporary basis. The cost of converting the Newington Hospital would be far less than that of erecting a new building, or even adding to the West Haven facility. Furthermore, a new hospital erected in New York or Rhode Island would likewise cost more and would do nothing to alleviate the hardships being endured by the parents and wives in Waterbury, Torrington, Ansonia, and in other cities and towns in my district and the State of Connecticut who are obliged to travel many hundreds of unnecessary miles to visit their loved ones.

If my recommendation called for a completely new building, other New England States would have legitimate reasons for demanding such construction in their respective areas. The question of whether those areas do need additional facilities is not the issue in this case; and if their situation is similar to the one which faces my district, and I suspect it is, I certainly will support any movement which would tend to bring relief to those areas. But here in Connecticut we already have a suitable building—not in full use—which could be readied in short order and with little expense for occupancy as a hospital solely for mentally ill veterans.

The shocking fact is that many of our boys are not receiving mental treatment of any kind at the present because of the long distances between their homes and veterans' hospitals outside of the State and the difficulty they encounter in securing admittance there because of the overcrowded conditions. The delay is tragic because time is all-important in the treatment of any mental case.

For example, last week I learned of a case where a veteran's wife and parents hesitated placing him in a hospital so far from their home in Waterbury. The parents are aging and the extensive travel would work a hardship on them. The wife and children would indeed be fortunate if they could see their husband and father several times a month. This is not an isolated case, and I could not help but wonder if this young man and others in similar circumstances had to travel the same distance to present themselves before selective-service boards not so many months previously.

There have been suggestions and recommendations made by various Veterans' Administration officials which add up to nothing but delay and more delay. Meanwhile, life moves on for those people and the hardships continue. I have yet to hear what I consider a valid reason why a mental hospital in the center of Connecticut is not established and operating to rehabilitate our veterans. I have been told that recruitment of sufficient psychiatrists for Newington is difficult, but that general medical and surgical personnel can be obtained from nearby Hartford. I do not think I need to point out to the Veterans' Administration that Yale, Harvard, and Columbia, as well as many other famous educational institutions in New England, have noted and extremely accomplished psychiatrists on their staffs, as well as those on the staffs of the State hospitals in Connecticut itself. Moreover, there is a long list of eminent

neurosurgeons in and about the State, some of whom are now available as consultants to veterans' hospitals. Surely this is a situation where good will and a bit of thinking and accommodation would combine to bring about a remedy.

The conversion of Newington has the support of all veterans' organizations in my district and, to my knowledge, there is no opposition from any organized or individual veterans to this project.

A humane regard for the veterans who desperately need mental care demands that the Government take effective action in their behalf. True economy forbids us to let facilities stand idle when veterans require care. I shall exert every effort to bring about the use of the Newington facilities for men whose care is one of the first responsibilities of the Government of the United States.

Increased Benefits Under the New Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress which is now coming to a close, I have worked for and supported legislation to increase the benefits under the social-security program.

I believe every person in the United States should come under social-security protection. The benefit age should be reduced from 65 years to 62 years.

Social security should be so improved that it will take the place of our present outdated and shameful old-age pension system.

Social-security payments at the age of 62 should not be denied on account of any other retirement or income benefits a person may be getting.

Although all the benefits I have worked for have not been enacted into law, I do believe this Congress has made a step in the right direction.

For the benefit of the citizens of my district, I would like to outline the benefits under the social-security program enacted by this Congress which I have supported and worked for during the past years:

INCREASED BENEFITS UNDER THE NEW SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

First. Average monthly wage: Your average monthly wage determines the amount of your benefits. The following chart will apply only if you worked at least 1½ years under the program since January 1, 1951.

(a) List by years all your earnings covered by social security, plus an estimate of your covered earnings up to the time you retire at age 65 or later. To realize the largest possible average monthly wage you may use either 1937 or 1951 as the starting date in your computation. Maximum covered annual earnings are as follows: 1937 through 1950, \$3,000; 1951 through 1954, \$3,600; after 1954, \$4,200.

(b) In computing your average wage, you may cross out four of the lowest income years listed. You can cross off an additional year if you have more than 5 years of covered employment at any time. You can also cross off years in which you were under an extended total disability.

(c) Next, add the total wages earned in the years not crossed off. Divide by the number of months involved in the remaining years. This will give you your average monthly wage. Now locate this amount on the chart below under the heading "Average Monthly Wage."

Second. Monthly retirement pay: You and your wife, if both 65, will receive benefits as shown on the chart below. If your wife is under 65 when you retire, you will receive the benefit of a single person until she reaches 65. Your widow, at 65, will receive payments indicated whether or not you retire before your death. A woman with a wage record receives benefits in her own right if a higher amount will be realized.

INCREASE FAMILY SECURITY (SURVIVOR'S MONTHLY BENEFITS)

Third. Surviving widow: Your widow, if you leave children under age 18, is entitled to benefits shown on the chart below, regardless of her age as long as any child is under the age of 18 years.

Fourth. Surviving parents or orphans: Your mother or father who are dependent on you are eligible for benefits only if there is no surviving widow or child. Benefits for a parent, age 65, and also for one orphan under 18 years, are shown on the chart. Two parents, or two or more orphans receive correspondingly larger amounts.

Fifth. Lump sum at death: Lump-sum payments are in addition to benefits to eligible survivors. In the event there is no widow or widower surviving, the payment is made to the person paying burial expenses.

Now find the amount payable in your case in the columns opposite the amount you have determined to be your average wage:

Estimated average monthly earnings to age 65	Monthly retirement payments at age 65			Monthly payments to surviving widow with—			Monthly payments to dependent parent or orphan	Lump-sum payment at death
	Husband and wife	Single	Widow	3 children	2 children	1 child		
\$54	\$45	\$30	\$30	\$50	\$50	\$45	\$30	\$90
\$60	66	44	33	66	66	66	33	132
\$100	82	55	41	82	82	82	41	165
\$120	93	62	46	96	96	93	46	187
\$140	99	66	49	112	112	99	49	199
\$150	102	68	51	120	120	102	51	205
\$160	105	70	52	128	128	105	52	211
\$170	108	72	54	136	136	108	54	217
\$180	111	74	55	144	144	111	55	223
\$190	114	76	57	152	152	114	57	229
\$200	117	78	58	160	157	117	58	235
\$210	120	80	60	168	161	120	60	241
\$220	123	82	61	176	165	123	61	247
\$230	126	84	63	184	169	126	63	253
\$240	129	86	64	192	173	129	64	255
\$250	132	88	66	200	177	132	66	255
\$260	135	90	67	200	181	135	67	255
\$270	138	92	69	200	185	138	69	255
\$280	141	94	70	200	189	141	70	255
\$290	144	96	72	200	193	144	72	255
\$300	147	98	73	200	197	147	73	255
\$310	150	100	75	200	200	150	75	255
\$320	153	102	76	200	200	153	76	255
\$330	156	104	78	200	200	156	78	255
\$340	159	106	79	200	200	159	79	255
\$350	162	108	81	200	200	162	81	255

O'Fallon, Ill., Observes 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on August 25, 26, and 27 of this year, the city of O'Fallon, in St. Clair County, Ill., will conduct a celebration and pageant commemorating its 100th anniversary.

O'Fallon is a community of more than 3,000 population. Its history, the man for whom it was named, and its changing economy typify the story of the growth of the United States.

The town was named for Col. John O'Fallon, a soldier, businessman, real-estate owner, and principal developer of the railroads in the area. He first came to St. Louis after fighting in the War of 1812, to become an assistant Indian agent.

O'Fallon was established as a railroad town, along what was then known as the Ohio & Mississippi Railroad. It is now a part of the Baltimore & Ohio system. Later coal fields were discovered and O'Fallon was a leading coal producing center. The coal mining activity has diminished, and O'Fallon is now principally a residential area. It is noted for having one of the most extensive of small town parks.

The centennial will open with an old-timers parade, and the coronation of the queen. A 2-day pageant will be presented, depicting the history of the town, with a completely local talent cast.

As the people of O'Fallon observe the city's 100th anniversary, I am certain they will not forget the sons of O'Fallon sent into military service in four wars. Fond tribute should be paid to the men of the community who served in the Armed Forces during the great wars which threatened our national existence. Particularly the people of O'Fallon should remember with pride and affection those who died in uniform.

O'Fallon has done its part in every national emergency. We know that it will always continue to do so. Much has happened to the world since O'Fallon was established, but let us hope that through these 100 years, nothing has happened to disturb the real strength of America. People who settled O'Fallon in 1854 had a lot to do with giving this nation its strength. Even with atomic weapons, America would be weak without the spirit and the faith of the men and women who founded her villages, her cities, and her towns. To carry the burdens of world leadership that now rest upon America, we need this strength of spirit in great measure.

I congratulate the village of O'Fallon and all its citizens as its 100th anniversary is observed.

**UNESCO: A State Department Agency
Created To Put the United States Into
a World Government**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the State Department during the tenure of office of Dean Acheson was and still is the propaganda mouthpiece of UNESCO in this country. The bill creating the United States National Commission for UNESCO was passed by the 79th Congress and was designed by the State Department to be the propaganda agency to sell UNESCO to the people of the United States. Being controlled by the State Department nothing was done by it except to carry out the instructions of the State Department. That condition still prevails and the State Department is in the process now of selling this system to the people.

UNESCO means the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and its purpose is to unite all people under one government, a world government. It makes no difference how wide apart the purposes of governments are, all are to be brought under one parent authority. Our theory of government is that our Government exists for the people, but in Russia the people exist for the Government. This is true, not only in Russia, but in the majority of the countries of the world. To amalgamate these two divergent theories into one is not only impossible, but it is assinine to try.

We here in the United States believe in capitalism as our theory of business operation, while Russia denounces capitalism and supplants it by communism. These two theories are as wide apart as the poles, and they cannot be brought together in one single purpose any more than water and oil will stay mixed. Yet UNESCO is out to build a world govern-

ment that will accomplish this impossible thing.

We here in the United States believe in the Christian religion as the very basis of all our strength in government, opportunities of the individual, our educational and cultural systems, while the Russians reject the story of Jesus Christ and scoff at the Christian religion. Yet UNESCO undertakes to harmonize these religious views, and present to the world one harmonious group of people under a one-world government. To attempt such a thing is, on the face of it, about as sane as was the notion that Canute, because of the power from on High possessed by him as King of England, could command the tide to stand back.

Of course the fact that Russia has joined UNESCO makes news. Luther Evans, former librarian of Congress now representing UNESCO, is credited with getting Russia and some of her satellites into the one-world frameup. If anyone in the United States could convince Russia that she should come in, Evans could do it. He has always been held in high esteem in Russia, and while librarian here had the Library of Congress stacked high with Russia propaganda. Much of this propaganda was sold by the Library to the public. I personally purchased an armful of it and delivered it to the proper committee investigating un-American activities.

Russia is smart enough to know that she will occupy the most powerful position under this new world government. The lower house of the world government is to be elected on the basis of population, hence Russia and China and their slave satellites will control that congress. We can have a world government all right if we will let Russia run it.

To bring this country into line to accept world government many things must be done by the United Nations and her agencies, such as UNESCO. First of all, love of country on the part of the people of the United States is found by these conspirators to be very deep and hard to destroy. Here UNESCO comes into play, and out it goes among the school children of the United States with specially trained teachers from Columbia University who teach those children that love of country—like that we have in the United States—interferes with a loyalty to a world organization; that they must be fitted, educationally, and temperamentally, to forget love of their own country and transfer their loyalty to the world organization. Washington's birthday ceremonies, Lincoln's birthday ceremonies and veneration of all our great men are to be abandoned, and are abandoned by those teachers trained at Columbia. If this succeeds, the next event that will be outmoded will be Christmas. In fact, propaganda is actually now going the rounds that Christmas is a myth.

Of course this world organization cannot afford to leave in the hands of the people the rights of free speech, a free press, and free religion, because the exer-

cise of these precious rights will have the power to prevent what these conspirators want. That has all been taken care of in the Convention of Human Rights, in which free speech, a free press, and free religion as expressed and defined in the Constitution of the United States is redefined and limited to suit the designs of the enemies of our Republic.

It will not suit these enemies if persons who are charged with crime by the world organization are to be tried in our courts, in our own country and under our own laws and Constitution. To overcome this they are to have courts of their own, they have a charter of their own; and if a citizen of the United States is charged with the violation of a United Nations law he can be tried in any foreign country by a court foreign to the nationality of the prisoner and under such rules as their court shall make. And UNESCO was granted by the United Nations Charter "legal capacity," "privileges and immunities" above and beyond our laws to carry out its program of world government throughout our Nation.

The State Department is right now supporting UNESCO through its United States National Commission for UNESCO, and its propaganda is designed to hide the truth from the people. Is the President aware of this situation? It is perfectly useless for us to spend our money, our resources, and the lives of our American boys, to stop the spread of communism eight or nine thousand miles from here while we permit the same intent and purpose to prosper here in the United States through this intellectual tool of communism. Those teachers, and the people sponsoring such teachers in their purpose to destroy love of country among our children here in United States are enemies of this Republic. The least I can do for this country is to use the free speech guaranteed by the Constitution while it lasts to warn the people of these United States that dangerous forces are at work here and now to destroy our constitutional Government.

Due to facts brought out before the McCarran committee in June of 1952, Public Law 495 was passed by the 82d Congress. Section 112 of the law provides:

None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used (1) to pay the United States contribution to any international organization which engages in the direct or indirect promotion of the principle of one world government or one world citizenship; (2) for the promotion, direct or indirect, of the principle or doctrine of one world government or one world citizenship.

Why do we not use this law? By enforcing it we could cut off the funds which keep UNESCO going, and summarily put a stop to its vicious propaganda which is designed to pervert the minds of our children, to deny our freedoms and to destroy our national sovereignty and constitutional form of government by forcing us into a world government where we would be only a subservient unit, subject to the will of the Communist-controlled majority.

Nation Soon To Enjoy Roadbuilding Boom

REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, motorists soon will get better, wider, and safer highways.

They will get these better roads because of legislation enacted by the present Republican Congress.

The Federal Government has been collecting about \$875 million a year from its Federal 2-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax. The Federal Government, however, has not been spending all of this gas tax money on building roads. The fact is that in recent years Congress has appropriated only about \$575 million a year for highway building. Congress has been diverting about \$300 million of its 2-cents-a-gallon gas tax revenues to other purposes than road building—such purposes as foreign aid.

Substantial sums of this diverted gas tax money actually has gone into building highways in foreign countries rather than in our own.

The House Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, this year, reported and Congress enacted a bill which provides that during the next 2 years \$875 million a year shall be given by the Federal Government to the States for highway building purposes.

In effect this bill assured that all of the Federal 2-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax revenues will go into road building and not be diverted to other purposes such as foreign aid.

HELPS COAST STATES

This bill grants to the States, from Federal gasoline taxes, \$300 million a year more money for road building purposes than the Federal Government ever has given the States heretofore for highway building.

These additional \$300 million which will be spent each year on highway construction means better and safer roads for motorists, more jobs and steadier employment for construction workers and a general increase in the Nation's prosperity due to the business and employment this additional huge construction program will generate.

The three Pacific Coast States as their share of larger highway appropriation will receive more than \$25 million a year in Federal highway funds than these States ever have received in any previous year.

Under this new law, California has been allocated \$47,108,037 of Federal funds for the coming year compared to \$30,269,269 last year or an increase of \$16,838,768.

Washington has been allocated \$14,061,986 for the coming year compared to \$9,240,247 for last year or an increase of \$4,821,739.

Oregon has been allocated \$12,889,469 for the coming year compared to \$8,661,811 or an increase of \$4,227,658.

States now can plan a big step-up in their road-building programs. The Nation, thanks to the highway legislation of this Congress, is about to enter upon the biggest road-construction program in its history.

This highway bill which came from my committee with the approval of President Eisenhower is a good bill.

All gasoline tax money, in my opinion, should go into building better and safer roads. The motorists and the motorists alone pay these gasoline taxes. The gas-tax money should be used for their benefit by employing it to provide better and safer highways. The Washington State Grange supports this idea.

The people of our Nation will pay for better and safer highways whether these roads are built or not. If better and safer roads are built these will cost money and the taxpayers will pay it.

However, if the roads are not built the taxpayers will pay for them just the same. They will pay for them in increased medical and hospital bills, in increased auto-repair bills, in increased consumption of gasoline and in greater wear and tear on tires and equipment. They will pay for them in the higher automobile insurance rates they will have to pay.

Building better and safer roads and the using of all gasoline tax revenues to do so is good sense and good economics.

Communists Lead Strike in Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the danger to the security of the United States of Communist dominated labor unions is demonstrated by a strike now going on in Detroit, Mich. Since June 15th more than 1,200 production workers in the main plant of the Square D Co., in Detroit, Mich., have been idle because of a strike called by the Communist-dominated United Electrical Workers Union.

The Detroit plant of the Square D Co., manufactures switches, circuit breakers, and electrical control panels for industrial and commercial applications. It also produces electrical components for military aircraft, supplies products to the Atomic Energy Commission and manufactures elements used in the Nation's guided missiles program.

In time of war the Detroit plant becomes 100 percent defense production. But in both war and peace, the company's products are vital to every basic industry in the United States.

PUSH-BUTTON STRIKE

The UE contends that the present strike at the Detroit plant is a result of the failure to reach an agreement on a new labor contract. The UE contends

it must have a contract which will "improve working conditions."

But there is ample evidence to indicate that this strike in Detroit was not called because of any bonafide complaint about pay or working conditions in the Detroit plant, but rather was push-buttoned into action by the Communist dominated UE national headquarters in New York.

Square D Co. has 6 other United States plants, including 1 in my home city of Milwaukee, and also 1 in Canada and 1 in Mexico. In the 51 years that the Square D Co. has been in business, it has never had a strike at any of its other 8 plants. The UE does not represent the workmen in any of the other plants of Square D Co. except a smaller factory at Peru, Ind.

OUTSTANDING RECORD

Yet, despite this outstanding record of the Square D Co. in its 8 other plants, they have had 3 strikes called by the UE in Detroit in less than a year. Altogether there has been almost 100 wildcat strikes and production interruptions in the Detroit plant since the last contract was signed with the UE 2 years ago.

The UE itself admits that the pay and working conditions at the Detroit plant of Square D are excellent. Before the last representation election at the Square D Co., on May 19, 1954—which unfortunately UE won—the UE's local at the Detroit plant—local 957—boasted of the fact that the plantwide straight-time average pay rate was \$2.25 per hour. Here is what a UE handout stated:

UE Local 957 is mighty proud of its achievement in collective bargaining. UE has built the best standards of wages, seniority, and other benefits here at our plant as well as in the other UE plants of Square D Co.

And the national UE News had this to state about the situation:

But employees of Square D weighed their union's performance against phony propaganda. The average straight-time hourly earnings here are \$2.25 an hour. This includes incentive and nonincentive workers.

Average wages of Square D are higher than those in the auto industry. Besides, the UE members have a contract which they did not want to be tampered with. It includes such things as a clause which gives retired workers a company-paid health plan for themselves and their wives.

Yet, less than a month later the UE was out on strike.

STRIKE'S REAL CAUSE

It would appear that the real cause of the strike at Detroit is the fact that in March 1954, Square D filed suit in Federal court against the UE, asking \$210,000 damages for losses the company suffered as the result of the two illegal strikes called by the local during the preceding 6 months. The company contends that these strikes were in violation of the no-strike clause in the labor contract.

Shortly after the filing of this suit, the company began withholding check-off dues from UE to offset the damages claimed in the Federal suit. Cutting off the flow of funds to the UE was regarded

as an unprecedented step in the company's determination to have the UE legally and financially responsible for its actions. UE national headquarters, acutely aware of delicate situations in other UE plants around the Nation, no doubt viewed the Square D Co.'s decision with considerable alarm.

Because of these illegal strikes, the company insisted when contract renewal time arrived that a stronger no-strike clause be inserted in its contract with the UE. UE, however, refused to approve of a stronger no-strike clause in the contract. It would thus appear that the no-strike issue in the company suit against local No. 957 of the UE is more of a factor in the present strike than the desire for "improved working conditions."

The Square D Co. is the last major outpost of the UE in Detroit. Not long ago the UE lost its position at Vickers, Inc., in Detroit.

Entirely apart from the almost unbelievable series of strikes and other production interruptions that have hit the Detroit plant while the most recent contract was in effect, is the UE's resistance to a strong no-strike clause in setting the course for future operations. Is flexibility to shut down strategic electrical plants, without legal recourse, during wartime or buildup for war, a key factor? Only the UE or the Communist Party, or both, has the answer to this and other puzzling questions involving the strike now on against the Square D Co.

COMMUNISTS IN CHARGE

One of the key figures in the present strike is Philip Saba, a prominent Communist functionary from Philadelphia. Saba, a UE International representative, has been imported from Philadelphia to take charge of the picket lines at Square D. It is reported to me that Saba's record is as follows:

August 1941: Saba was subpoenaed in Philadelphia in connection with frauds in Communist Party election petitions. He was unable to produce a draft registration card when picked up. Under oath he admitted being a Communist Party member since the mid 1930's. Saba's wife, Velma, is also registered as a Communist Party member.

December 1943: Saba named labor secretary of the 33d ward branch of the Communist Party's section 5 in Philadelphia.

April 1944: Saba was active as member of Northeast Club of the Communist Political Association. Remained through March 1945 while then employed as a UE organizer.

1946: Saba assigned to Club 155, Philadelphia, comprised of Reds who were members of local 155.

May 1947: Saba named membership director of the Tom Paine Club on the United States Attorney General's list as a subversive organization.

September 1948: Saba participated in the Philadelphia County Communist Party Convention.

ARRESTED FOR VIOLENCE

April 1949: Saba arrested in Pennsauken Township, N. J., as leader of strike

violence at which 1 man was beaten and car containing 6 workers overturned.

May 1949: Saba jailed in Camden County Prison, N. J., for criminal contempt. Earlier the same court convicted Saba for violating an injunction against rioting and for using vile and obscene language.

October 1952: Saba identified as Communist Party member in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities—while serving as a UE organizer and also as the organizer for the metal trades section of the Communist Party in Philadelphia.

August 1953: Saba produced cash funds to bail out Dave Davis, UE organizer and national Communist Party leader, picked up in FBI roundup of Reds.

June 1954: Saba drove to Detroit to help on picket lines of Square D strike, carrying a supply of Communist literature in the trunk of his Chevrolet.

Immediately above Saba in the UE chain of command is Dave Mates.

DAVE MATES' RECORD

Dave Mates is the man to whom Saba currently reports. Mates, a UE international representative, is sitting in on the negotiations with the company. The Daily Worker records the long-time identity of Mates with Communist activities in this country. He was labeled a suspect Red in sworn testimony before the House Un-American Activities in Detroit in 1952.

Next above Mates in the UE chain of command are the well-known Communist promoters, James Matles and Julius Empsak. Matles, the UE organizational director, and Empsak, the secretary-treasurer of UE, run the national UE which has infiltrated its Red tentacles into more than 100 defense plants in the United States.

MATLES' TESTIMONY

I include herewith excerpts from hearings before a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives of the 80th Congress in 1948, of which subcommittee I was chairman:

EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS BEFORE A SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 80TH CONGRESS

(Tuesday, September 28, 1948, Washington, D. C.)

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN (chairman of subcommittee). Will you state your full name?

Mr. MATLES. James J. Matles.

Mr. KERSTEN. And your position.

Mr. MATLES. Director of organization of the UE (p. 94 of hearings).

Mr. KERSTEN. Will you state, Mr. Matles, whether you are now or ever were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATLES. I will answer that question to you, Mr. Chairman, as an officer of this union and as a citizen, as officer sworn to uphold the constitution of my union and a citizen who swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States. And today your committee has blacklisted and fired men in Evansville, Ind., because they refused to divulge their political or religious beliefs.

You have fired them. You have blacklisted them, and I object to that question on

constitutional grounds. I object to that question. And I will not permit you, Mr. Chairman, to get me, as an officer of this union, to do less than what my members are doing in the defense of the constitution of this union or the Constitution of the United States.

I am glad that the various provisions of that Constitution of the United States permit me to have my politics and my religion to be my own business, and not to permit you to try to frame me in any way (p. 112).

Mr. KERSTEN. Now, on April 23, 1940, Thomas O'Shea testified before a House committee that he had attended meetings of the Communist Party with you. Is that correct?

Mr. MATLES. Are you asking my associations?

Mr. KERSTEN. I am asking you whether or not O'Shea's testimony that he attended meetings of the Communist Party with you are correct?

Mr. MATLES. I have answered that question before. I have said to you that I am not going to give you the opportunity to dig into my politics, my religion, my associations, on constitutional grounds.

Mr. KERSTEN. In other words, you refuse to answer that on constitutional grounds?

Mr. MATLES. I refuse to answer under the first and fifth amendments (p. 114).

Mr. FISHER. You are not willing to testify publicly here whether you do or do not know William Z. Foster, the chairman of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. MATLES. I am not willing to testify on my associations with anybody.

Mr. FISHER. What is your objection to testifying to that?

Mr. MATLES. I believe that my associations are my own business, sir, and I believe that you are invading my rights under the Constitution.

Mr. FISHER. Which particular rights are you talking about?

Mr. MATLES. The first and fifth amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. FISHER. You refuse to say whether you know William Z. Foster or not. Do you know Eugene Dennis, the secretary of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATLES. I have answered the question that I do not care to discuss my associations, whether with the employers, with people in the country at large, or with Members of Congress.

Mr. FISHER. You have told us a number of people you know. You said you knew Mr. Murray and Mr. Conroy and quite a number of others.

Mr. MATLES. People in our union.

Mr. FISHER. When I ask you about these Communists you do not want to tell me.

Mr. MATLES. When you ask me about anybody outside of my union, those are associations—those are private associations.

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY BEFORE A SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 80TH CONGRESS

EMPSAK TESTIMONY

(September 28 and 29, 1948, Washington, D. C.)

Mr. KERSTEN. Your full name.

Mr. EMPSAK. Julius Empsak.

Mr. KERSTEN. You are secretary-treasurer of the UE; are you?

Mr. EMPSAK. That is correct (p. 137).

Mr. KERSTEN. Do you know William Z. Foster? (Chairman, Communist Party, United States of America.)

Mr. EMPSAK. Well, chairman, I feel that you are approaching again the question of

whether or not a person has certain rights insofar as his personal rights are concerned on a social-political belief, and so on, and under those circumstances, I am afraid I will refuse to answer you (pp. 137-138).

Mr. KERSTEN. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. EMSPAK. I refuse to answer that without the advice of my counsel (p. 138).

Mr. KERSTEN. Is it not a fact, Mr. Empsak, that you were present at the trial of Earl Browder by the executive committee or by one of the committees of the Communist Party?

(Consultation between the witness and his counsel.)

Mr. EMSPAK. Mr. Chairman, because of the character of the question involving the question of my association with whomever I may choose to associate, I feel that I cannot answer your question. I feel that it is an intrusion on my personal life, my activities, an unwarranted attempt to impose a certain kind of censorship, you please; and under the circumstances, I reserve my rights not to answer the question (p. 154).

Mr. KERSTEN. I will ask you once again: Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. EMSPAK. Mr. Chairman, that is the question we broke off on last night, if you recall, yesterday afternoon.

Mr. KERSTEN. That is right.

Mr. EMSPAK. And I suggested that I wished to discuss this matter with counsel, and, of course, I did.

Mr. KERSTEN. Yes.

Mr. EMSPAK. And I have come prepared to answer that question.

Mr. KERSTEN. All right, what is your answer?

Mr. EMSPAK. My answer to that question is—and I would like to quote, I think, as good an authority as there is on the—

Mr. FISHER. I object to his quotation.

Mr. KERSTEN. The question is simple. Just a minute—

Mr. EMSPAK. My answer to that question is that I reserve my rights as an American citizen, under the first and fifth amendments, to refuse to answer that question because—

Mr. KERSTEN. All right, you do not have to give us the reasons (pp. 157-158).

New York City, N. Y., October 6, 1948.

Mr. KERSTEN. Have you ever been to a Communist Party headquarters here in New York City?

Mr. EMSPAK. That, Mr. Chairman, I refuse to answer, because I believe you are invading certain basic rights and privileges of individuals.

Mr. KERSTEN. Is it not true, Mr. Empsak, that you attended the sessions of the Communist Party at the Communist Party headquarters here in New York, during the hearing on the status of Earl Browder in June 1945?

Mr. EMSPAK. I think I answered that, didn't I, last week?

Mr. KERSTEN. What is your answer today?

Mr. EMSPAK. The same as I had last week.

Mr. KERSTEN. What was that?

Mr. EMSPAK. I don't believe that the committee should go into the question of association for the purpose of trying to impute certain beliefs to individuals, and I think that our Constitution protects us against that kind of an intrusion.

Mr. KERSTEN. Do you recall that on this occasion, during the secret trial of Earl Browder by the Communist Party, in June of 1945, that Mr. Krumbein presided?

Mr. EMSPAK. I refuse to answer that question, on the same grounds.

SQUARE-D STRIKE: "DRY RUN"

Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the reasons the UE has called the strike at Square D, is to have a dry run on their ability to close plants vital to American defense efforts. By thus keeping their lines of power in good working order, they know they can cripple the entire American defense industry in time of crisis. For the UE is the bargaining representative throughout much of the American electrical industry which is indispensable to all American production.

HOOVER TESTIMONY

On December 9, 1953, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, testified before a House Subcommittee on Appropriations and asserted that the Communist Party operation in the maritime, mining, electrical, and communications, constituted a major and dangerous threat to our national security. I include here-with an excerpt from the testimony of the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover before this subcommittee:

EXTRACTS FROM TESTIMONY OF HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

In regard to the infiltration of labor, the Communists regard labor unions as instruments to be controlled and used to develop the Communist revolution.

A national conference held in August of this year of the Communist Party reaffirmed the time-honored premise that control of the labor union is of primary importance to the development of the Communist revolution in this country.

They designed, particularly, the automobile industry as being the prime target because it is well known that it is one of the most vital industries to our national defense production.

In New York, the party has set a goal for 65 percent of its membership to become employed in the basic industries of the country. Instructions were issued for the reorganization of the Communist Party in Los Angeles recently to organize on an industrial basis and party members were requested to secure work in the basic industries in that area, thus showing the trend of placing as many members as they can in the key industries of the country—the basic industries which if disrupted would materially affect our national defense.

Currently, some trade unions operating in the maritime, mining, electrical, and the communications fields are chief strongholds of the Communist Party. The Communist Party still maintains its strongest bases in those unions, which were expelled from the CIO during 1949 and 1950. All of this poses a major and dangerous threat to our national security, because it involves these various unions that were expelled by the CIO. One of those unions represents a large portion of all employees in the electrical industry of the United States. Another union that was expelled exercises life-and-death control over our Pacific coast commerce; another union has members employed in the production of copper and zinc which are essential to the national defense efforts.

BILL TO CURE REDS

On February 17, 1954, I introduced into the House H. R. 7950. This legislation which I proposed would prohibit the Federal Government from placing war contracts with companies where the

Communist UE or other Communist unions prevail.

This bill would also amend the Taft-Hartley Act by redefining the term "labor organization" to exclude organizations which are Communist-dominated. Any Communist-dominated union would thereby cease to have any right to act as a bona fide union or representative of employees. This bill specifically empowers the Subversive Activities Control Board to investigate and determine if a labor union is a Communist-action or Communist-front organization as defined in the Subversives Control Act of 1950.

The bill also expands the Taft-Hartley non-Communist oath by requiring both labor officials and employers to execute such an oath annually and extends the oath to cover not only the Communist Party but also any other organizations determined to be Communist organizations by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Tenth Anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] for having set aside this hour to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Warsaw uprising. Ten years ago, on August 1, the underground army of Warsaw fought the Nazi Army. For 63 days these brave people fought and sacrificed their lives that the Allies of World War II might be victorious. In the end, 300,000 Polish patriots sacrificed their lives with the hope and expectation that Poland would once again be free. This is but one of many battles in which Polish warriors sacrificed their lives for freedom and independence.

As a member of a select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate Communist aggression throughout the world, I had the honor and privilege to hear the direct testimony of General Bor-Komorowski and General Anders. Their testimony was taken in London, England. We also heard other Polish patriots, now living in exile in England, Germany, and Italy, vividly describe the pain, suffering, and death occasioned by the infamous betrayal by the Soviet Army that promised to aid them in their uprising. Their testimony revealed the perseverance of the Polish people to defeat the war machine of Adolf Hitler.

Even today, we discovered that the fight against communism and bolshevism continues at this moment. The success of the Kremlin is based on fear, torture, massacre, and murder of their enslaved people. Our committee heard that there are 20 million innocent people in concentration camps in northern and

eastern Russia. People of Poland, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and even citizens of Russia are confined in these slave labor prisons contrary to the most elementary concept of human dignity.

The policy of the United States during and after World War II bears a part of the responsibility for the plight of the Polish nation. The Yalta and Teheran agreements deprived eastern European nations of their rightful place in the family of free nations. The nations of eastern Europe were not consulted about these agreements and did not participate in these conferences. The secrecy of these agreements did not become public until the U. N. conference assembled in San Francisco. For the first time, the American public discovered the great betrayal of the Polish people. The United States has a duty and an obligation to redeem itself from this great betrayal. I have said before, and I repeat now, that the United States should repudiate these agreements and do everything in its power to restore freedom to these enslaved nations.

The people of Poland will revolt again. They will fight their oppressors just as they fought 10 years ago. When that time comes, the United States must show her determination to help these millions of oppressed people to eradicate the tyrants of Moscow. This blow must be a final one. Then, and only then, will the world be in peace.

Poland will once again be free and independent. When a desire for freedom burns in the hearts of men, no dictator can extinguish that desire even with fear, torture, massacre, or slave labor camps. The present oppressors of Poland will never destroy the desire of freedom of the Polish people.

Dorchester Day, 1630-1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article written by me entitled "Dorchester Day, 1630-1954," together with an excellent poem entitled "Mother Dorchester Towne," written by John Meade.

The town of Dorchester, Mass., now a part of Boston, Mass., is one of the most historic communities in North America.

The above-mentioned follows:

DORCHESTER DAY, 1630-1954

(By Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts)

One reason I like so much to write this article is because in Congress most of us are caught up in the stream of current and crisis history. Our grasp of the essentials has a tendency to become blurred unless we return to our origins, our roots, so to speak, and replenish our understanding of the United States of America by going back to its sources. Dorchester Day brings to the sur-

face of our time an abundant and a very special kind of typical American history. If you were with me in Washington from day to day and hour to hour—and I wish you could be—you would be, I am sure, amazed to recognize how closely knit are the decisions of this moment with the principles and the traditions of our country, as they developed from the days in 1630 when Dorchester was founded.

Like the sound and solid guidance for life we learn at our mother's knee and in the home, so in the halls of government, where sometimes grave decisions have to be taken, we get our sense of direction, our insistence on integrity, our strength of conscience, from familiarity with the circumstances of America's beginning and America's growth. That is why I am so happy to prepare this article because it affords the opportunity to steep again in the historical folklore of our country. One reason I believe that the American people have been so wise in their judgments through the decades is because they have maintained their reverence for history and the past, as exemplified by this ceremony today. Their judgments have been imbedded deep in their knowledge of what went before and their respect for it—and by the past I mean not only our past in relation to 1630, but also, their past, in relation to the story of American justice, and to the Old and New Testament to which they were so profoundly devoted.

We are a religious people, and what we celebrate on this anniversary of the establishment of Dorchester seems to me to be a part of the design of an infinite will. Surely the long, often peaceful, sometimes violent, story of Dorchester is not just a happenstance that occurred as one might turn a street corner either to the west or to the east; an event in time and space unrelated to anything else and alone. No; as we examine the pattern, we must find the finger of God tracing the story: We see how intimately the story of Dorchester is interwoven, and how subtly, with the rest of the early history of our country. We see how it is practically one with the landing of the Pilgrims in 1620. We cannot miss its remarkable involvement with the events of the American Revolution, with the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights, and with the expansion to the West and the building of our country. We must see how robust and adamant the Colonies were in the conquest of nature itself on this rockbound coast, and how fearfully they contended with the Indians.

All of this gives us this day evidence of the patient and paternal touch of the divine will.

But there is also testimony even more concrete. It was, after all, religious men and women who played what, I must believe, is the chief role in the organization of the founders of Dorchester even before they left England for the American shore. It was a Rev. John Warham and a Rev. John Maverick who were the ministers and leaders of the little group that met in Plymouth, England, and constituted themselves a church community. In reaching out for this historical material I am in great part indebted—and very much so—to the Dorchester, Mass., tercentenary committee of 1930, and to the subcommittee on the historical booklet, of which Patrick J. Connelly, former postmaster of Boston, Mass., was chairman, and Richard P. Bonney was editor, and which included Mary B. Corr, Edward A. Huebener, and Carrie M. W. Weis. The research they did, the information they compiled, the story they organized and presented is for me an excellent piece of workmanship, fashioned with an affectionate objectivity, and I am proud to employ a good deal of it in writing this article. I think we would do well—if this has not already been done—to put out a reissue of this booklet so that

every home in Dorchester, perhaps every home in Boston, might have a copy.

For our world is caught—as if suspended—in a dreadful impasse of history, a unique state of tension, which has been described as a "cold war" and which is marked by "hot war" interludes—Korea and Indochina. The struggle that is now clearly defined between a free and a slave world depends for its success, for either side, on the winning of the support of mankind. The historical product we have, so to put it, to sell to the human race, is well told by our contemporaries as it was magnificently lived by our forebears. It is this we need to propagandize first among ourselves, by the distribution among us, of material like this splendid booklet, and then among the peoples of the world by acquainting them with the history of freedom as we struggled for it and won it on these shores. If the masters of the Kremlin knew this history only half as well as we know it, they would recognize the folly of presuming that a people in possession of so sacred a treasure as the American credo would ever permit its betrayal, or would ever submit to a tyranny that strikes to the very heart of the edifice our people created on this soil.

Let us, therefore, no matter how well we may know it or how often we have heard it repeated, review again in brief this mite of history, as we would repeat a sacred and familiar prayer, not because it is new but because it is loved. And we can thank our enemies, actual or potential, for reminding us that this liberty, this democratic government, this Bill of Rights, this dignity of the individual, this system of free schools, this election freely by secret ballot, this equal justice under law, this right of petition, this "We, the people," this "Nation, under God," cannot be taken for granted except at our peril. We can thank the enemy for reminding us that as it was won by endless effort and endless combat, so it can be lost by shameful neglect and slothful indifference.

A people intensely devoted to Dorchester's patriotic past, as we who celebrate Dorchester Day, can be expected to follow in the footsteps of those whose deeds we honor. I do not believe we will let ourselves forget that Dorchester is derived from Dorsetshire in England, afterward called Dorchester, and that the early settlers largely came from there, founding the Dorchester which is now a historical community on this continent. There was in England's Dorchester a Rev. John White, rector of St. Peter's Church in that city, who well before the sailing of the *Mayflower* dreamed and planned a settlement in the New World that would be guided by the precepts of religion. As you see, the religious influence was invariably predominant, even as it was with the great Jesuit Fathers whose explorations opened up to civilization and to Christianity other great territories on this continent, and as it was, of course, predominant in the life of Columbus himself, the first and the greatest explorer of them all.

The religious and political persecutions of James I and his son, Charles, hastened the plan. The Reverend Mr. White associated himself with other leading Puritans. The Massachusetts Bay Company was organized and John Endicott was sent here to found Salem in 1628. With the help of a Lord Dorchester, a courtier of King Charles I, a liberal charter was secured by the Massachusetts Bay Company. This permitted them to settle and govern the area on these shores between the Charles and the Merrimac Rivers, and that, it may be said, from a real-estate standpoint, is the practical beginning of the great project. It will be noted that many historic communities were included in the original grant, including what is now the South Boston section of Boston. Like Moses, who also dreamed and planned and admin-

istered much but never, himself, got to the Holy Land, so the Reverend Mr. White never left the Church of England, though sympathetic to the Puritans, and in fact never left England. His achievement, in the practical sense, consisted in seeing to it that one of the ships in the fleet sent out by the Bay Company carried a considerable group of his own parishioners to the new land. This ship was called the *Mary and John* and the two churchmen I mentioned before, the Reverend Mr. Warham and the Reverend Mr. Maverick, headed the expedition. I am told that visitors from New England to Dorchester, England, make it a point to visit the grave of the Reverend Mr. White in the porch of St. Peter's as one visits a shrine. The two ministers I mentioned whom he had selected to head the mission were permeated with his views on religion and education and the spirit of self-government.

The voyage in this 400-ton vessel began on March 20, 1630, and ended 70 days later. Actually they landed at what is now Hull. With the help of settlers who had been here before them, they moved their goods and cattle to better ground, pending the findings of exploring parties sent out in quest of a permanent settlement. One exploring company followed the Charles River to what is now the arsenal at Watertown. The second company was delighted with a spot the Indians called Mattapanook. They especially liked its salt marshes for pasture and its rocky hill for defense. The Mattapanook of the Indians was, of course, South Boston, and the marsh, as you know, is called the cow pasture to this day. That rocky eminence is today Savin Hill. It has been a rather reliable guess that they set foot at first at what is now the junction of Pleasant and East Cottage Streets in the area that came to be identified as Allen's Plain.

This was Dorchester as of 1631.

Under conditions that we today would consider rude and inhospitable beyond endurance, they built their thatch-roofed cabins and their meeting house in a close community as a common protection against possibly hostile Indians. With the Indian threat later eliminated the area of occupation widened.

I quote an interesting bit of this history from the tercentenary document. It says:

"The first houses were built along a road stretching from the first meeting house to the Rock Hill of the settlers, the Savin Hill of today, where a fort was located. It followed the line of Pleasant Street and Savin Hill Avenue. Another early road covered the route of Pond Street and Crescent Avenue to the cow pasture. From the five corners at the end of Pond Street, a lane ran toward the neck (Boston Street). Jones Hill was circled by a road following the lines of Stoughton, Hancock, and Pleasant Streets to Savin Hill Avenue. Access to Roxbury and Boston was over a road running from the meeting house along Cottage, Humphrey, and Dudley Streets to the center of old Roxbury at Eliot Square. When Israel Stoughton set up his grist mill at the falls of the Neponset in 1633, it was necessary to build a road across the great lots. This left Hancock Street at the foot of Meeting House Hill, and followed Winter and Adams Streets to the lower mills. It became an important route from Boston to the Plymouth colony, and was known as the Lower Road."

For me these data hold an intriguing quaintness because, like all of you, I know these names and these places so well, and what I am relating goes back more than 300 years.

These names and these places, down through the centuries, are a part of the fabric of the Nation's history. The first church, at Cottage and Pleasant Streets, was not only a house of worship but a civic center,

a school, a storage place for valuables, and a powder magazine. From time to time it was enlarged and improved and finally moved to a better site, the east side of Winter Street, at what has as a result become Meeting House Hill. The church was the heart of the community, the source of its leadership. In fact, church membership was an indispensable qualification for citizenship. There are many examples of church decisions enforced by the secular arm.

It has been recorded by our tercentenary historians that Dorchester was first to organize local government by the town meeting, and that it was first to establish a free school supported by public taxation. No contradiction of these claims has come to my attention. No doubt other communities in New England would have adopted these ideas for education and self-government, even if there had never been a Dorchester settlement. But I am proud to shout from the hilltops Dorchester's claims in this respect. Again in refreshing one's Americanism at the fountain source of American tradition, in determining questions on public aid to education, in seeking out the nature of free government, and official decision democratically arrived at, one must feed one's thinking in just such history as that of Dorchester. For the very heartbeat of American life goes back directly to what our forebears did in Dorchester when they established—for the first time on this soil—the town meeting and tax-supported education.

The memorable date of the first town meeting was October 8, 1633.

The founding fathers then stipulated that "the men of the colony should meet on every Monday evening, at the meeting house, there to settle and set down such orders as may tend to the general good, and every man to be bound thereby without gain-saying or resistance."

It might be helpful, in the light of the appropriation facts of our own time, to recall that the town's appropriation proved inadequate to run the first free school in Dorchester, so that perhaps it is not correct to say that it was wholly free, for a small tuition fee was charged to make up the difference. On the other hand, I do not believe it can be said that education was in any way frustrated because of this fee, for our founding fathers were wise and liberal enough to make it payable, if necessary, in firewood. And it would seem to me that just about the most abundant product in the whole wide world at that time was firewood from the vast wilderness that enveloped the early settlers. What the taxation failed to provide in the way of education for the young, came from the sweat of the brow that produced the necessary amount of firewood. Thinking of this hour and looking back, as one called upon to help decide appropriations in the Congress of the United States, I must say I can find precious little fault with that arrangement.

The process may not be suitable to our time but the principle, it seems to me, is ideal.

Dorchester deserves another singular pre-eminence in history, which I do not believe has been properly noted, probably because of the greater scope of an achievement along kindred lines by William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania. The people who founded Dorchester dealt fairly with the Indians, and both settlers and Indians profited accordingly. When the two groups first met, the Indians held up a fish to show their peaceful intentions and the pioneers held up a biscuit. Back in 1657 some 6,000 acres of land were given over to the Indians as a reservation at a place then called Ponkapoag and now known as the town of Canton. We can only guess how many American scalps and Indian lives were saved as a result of the

intelligent and Christlike relationship the Dorchester settlers maintained with the Massachusetts Indians. When the citizens of Dorchester girded their loins to fight the Indians, it was against the Pequots of Connecticut in 1636, and the Narragansett tribesmen of King Philip in 1675. Their participation was rather as the result of an alliance, and not as the consequence of direct relationship of the citizens of Dorchester with the Indians who had become hostile.

In our relationships with less advanced portions of the earth today I believe we can take a page from the book of the early Dorchester settlers.

American character, independence, and just plain raw courage, run through the whole story of Dorchester participation in the American Revolution. They did not like the Stamp Act, and they said so. They instructed their representative, one John Robinson, to do all he could to secure the act's repeal. In 1770 they went so far as to pass resolutions pledging themselves to boycott goods of British origin. The Dorchester Committee of Correspondence met with other committees in Faneuil Hall in 1773 to discuss what should be done about British ships loaded with tea in Boston Harbor. Dorchester, through its representative, defied the British Parliament, when the British destroyed the independence of the Massachusetts General Court. Dorchester's voice was strong in the Suffolk Resolves which carried in their temper and meaning some of the thinking that later emerged in the more historic Declaration of Independence. An important group of Dorchester citizens risked their lives in adopting the Suffolk Resolves at the home of a Daniel Vose, which was across the Neponset River in Milton Lower Mills.

Dorchester both before and during the revolution was in the midst of its danger and its fury.

There were 350 Dorchester men who fought under Washington. They participated in the brilliant series of maneuvers by which General Washington drove the British from Boston, and in the course of which Dorchester Heights played so prominent a role. Support from Dorchester to the revolution was loyal and constant. On May 23, 1776, the town passed a resolution pledging the Continental Congress its support should the decision be made to declare the Thirteen Colonies independent.

There is a vast history that cannot be touched in this brief pointing up of the highlights. There was the role for example that Dorchester citizens played in the Civil War contributing 1,342 men out of a population of 10,000 and losing 97. There was the incredible growth of trade and industry, and the concurrent increase of population to more than 200,000 in our own time. It was in Dorchester that for the first time in New England corn was ground by power. Dorchester gave the Nation its first playing cards. It furnished great names to the Nation: Edward Everett, United States Senator, Ambassador to England, writer and orator; the industrialists James Baker and Roswell Gleason; Joseph Lord, who founded Dorchester, South Carolina; John Lothrop Motley, the historian; Samuel J. Barrows, editor; Maria Cummins and William T. Adams, poets; Josephine Preston Peabody, the poetess; Lucy Stone, the Reverend Hugh Blunt, poet. Dorchester gave us Henry L. Pierce and George Hibbard, notable in the field of public service, and John F. Fitzgerald, a Dorchester resident, all three having been mayors of Boston. Marshall P. Wilder, merchant, philanthropist, and statesman, the founder of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, was a citizen of Dorchester. And there were other great preachers, writers, and publicists. In passing I might say the late John F. Fitzgerald was grandfather of United States Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Dorchester diminished in territorial size from time to time, and this in itself is a sign of the thirst for self-government and independence; for it was the very desire for independence in New England that led to the breaking up of the large towns for smaller self-governed units.

In line with this spirit, Dorchester at first fought annexation to Boston. But as community life became more complex, as communication media developed, and as transportation provided greater concentration without any real loss of autonomy, sentiment changed, and in 1869 the people of Dorchester voted for annexation to Boston, by a vote that nevertheless showed a strong remaining sentiment for separation. By January 4, 1870, Dorchester's existence as a town ended.

Time and again I have thought of the significance of Dorchester as a precious fragment of my country. The vast industries it now supports; its teeming and active population. Its cultural life, its religious life—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—its schools and its theaters. Its alert publications. Its extraordinary aliveness; its throbbing Americanism.

Yes, it gave us our first town meeting and it gave us our first tax-supported school. It fought in ever war and it dealt fairly with its neighbors.

What, you may ask, is its significance? What does it add up to? It adds up to this: It makes for the greatest comfort that can come to the American soul in the hours of long and bitter tension the world is experiencing today. For what is true of Dorchester is true, in essence, of the thousands of other American communities, and it is true of the whole of the United States. Philadelphia has its Constitution Day, and Texas remembers the Alamo. Just as Dorchester dealt fairly with the people the settlers found here in 1630, so the United States dealt fairly with Cuba and Puerto Rico and the Philippines; so the United States needs no fortified frontiers either at the Mexican or the Canadian borders.

The United States as a nation has a character that gets its strength from faith in God and from the education and the enlightenment of its people.

Today, we are confronted with a menace that is without parallel in all of human history. The story of Dorchester explains why an almighty providence has put us—this great Nation—in position, through a divine plan, for leadership of the free world. The story of Dorchester explains why—thank God—the cleavage between the free and the slave world today is so clear, is so undisputable, that we can accurately and truthfully identify the two great contenders, one as free, the other as slave.

Never has the line been more clearly and plainly drawn.

What our forbears have done for us is to help us with their example to see the path we must follow. They wanted freedom enough to dare and suffer anything. They have given us that heritage.

There is in Dorchester a sample of the strength and the character of this Nation. This gives hope not only to us, but to the whole free world. We have tremendous strength in being: economic strength, military strength, the strength of leadership in statecraft, in science, in just sheer energy and initiative. It has been built in us through the centuries and it is now in full growth. But we have above all the vigor that comes from the faith that gave such power to the heart and the sinews of the early settlers, and that is the source of our great inner might today. These are the forces that guarantee our security. With might resting on these foundations, the enemy cannot destroy us—and I believe that the Kremlin knows it.

We have a sublime faith to live by, and I hope to see and participate in many Dor-

chester Days yet to come, in a strong and peaceful and a happy America and in a peaceful world.

MOTHER DORCHESTER TOWNE

Proudly we gather to celebrate here;
The birth of a town that we love and revere;
Dorchester, where highlights of history were made;

Deserves every tribute that now can be paid.

Here stands the site of the first public school;
Where "Free to the Rich and the Poor" was the rule;

Here where the Pilgrims assembled and planned;

Dorchester's town meetings the first in this land.

Her sons helped to fortify Dorchester Heights.
They helped too to draw up our famed Bill of Rights;

They also made plans to throw into the sea;
A cargo of Britain's much overtaxed tea.

By giving this Nation great men of renown;
They earned the name "Mother Dorchester Towne,"

Where the good neighbor spirit is still to be found;

God bless every inch of her dear hallowed ground.

—By John Meade.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I think that all Members of the 83d Congress should be proud, as am I, of our action in regard to the extension of the Federal social-security program. The House of Representatives passed the social-security bill almost unanimously. The Senate Finance Committee has reported favorably upon the bill which will extend social-security protection to several million additional persons not now entitled to benefits under the program, and which will increase benefits to all persons now receiving old-age and survivors insurance.

As I review the accomplishments of the 83d Congress, I am particularly proud of our progress in this humane field. However, I have sought in vain to find any action which this Congress has taken to increase benefit payments to those persons who receive Federal-State old-age assistance under title I of the Federal Security Act. There are in the United States today, almost 2½ million persons who receive old-age assistance benefits. The maximum amount of payment in which the Federal Government will participate is a grant of \$55 per month per individual. Under the present matching formula, the Federal Government contributes \$35 per month and the State \$20 per month on a maximum payment of \$55.

Since 1946 every Congress has increased the Federal share of assistance payments by \$5 per case, which has enabled the States to pass on this \$5 additional monthly benefit to those persons

who can qualify for old-age assistance. The 83d Congress, 2d session, has not taken recognition of the inadequacy of the present payments to the old-age assistance recipients, although we all recognize the fact that living costs are soaring, and that any person attempting to live on \$55 a month is hard pressed indeed. In my own State of Missouri, 133,732 received old-age assistance grants in the month of June. The majority of these persons received the maximum payment of \$55 a month. In my own congressional district, the 11th District of Missouri, there are 14,981 persons who receive old-age assistance under the State-Federal program. Unless some action is taken by the Congress in the closing days of this session to revise the Federal formula and provide additional money to the States, the 2½ million persons in our country over 65 years of age now on old-age assistance will have nothing to look forward to in the next 2 years as far as increased assistance checks are concerned. These fine old citizens of the United States have paid taxes, have reared and educated their children, and have made our Nation strong.

It is my earnest belief that the Congress should move at once to rectify this situation and to provide legislation and appropriations to substantially increase the old-age assistance checks for all of the 2½ million persons who now receive monthly assistance grants, so that they will be better able to provide themselves with the necessities of life and will have a brighter, happier old age as they go down the sunset slope of life.

The following table shows information by counties in my congressional district:

11th congressional district

County	Number of old-age assistance recipients June 1954	Number of old-age insurance recipients Jan. 1, 1954
Total (17 counties)...	14,981	5,573
Benton.....	597	154
Boone.....	1,328	821
Camden.....	543	175
Carroll.....	659	255
Chariton.....	821	179
Cole.....	677	579
Cooter.....	783	276
Dallas.....	779	156
Hickory.....	419	55
Howard.....	706	164
Laclede.....	1,130	314
Miller.....	810	182
Moniteau.....	754	208
Morgan.....	506	210
Pettis.....	1,682	740
Randolph.....	1,433	588
Saline.....	1,254	507

Conmar Plant in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I point to Greenwood, Miss., my own home town and the home of many of my con-

stituents, as a prototype of the remarkable industrialization that today is taking place in the South.

Historically an agricultural community, 6 months from now Greenwood will also be an important center of the rapidly growing southern apparel industry.

This great development in the economic nature of Greenwood will be the result of an all-out effort by the up-to-date civic leaders and citizenry of the community and of the foresight of one of the Nation's leading manufacturers of slide fasteners.

It is my pleasure to report that ground has been broken in Greenwood for the largest zipper manufacturing facility below Mason and Dixon's line by Conmar Products Corp., of Newark, N. J.

An ultramodern \$750,000 building will house \$500,000 worth of Conmar-designed and built production equipment, will eventually employ about 300 Greenwood people, and will bring an annual payroll of about \$1 million to the area. This major industrial enterprise will produce 50 million zippers annually for the fast growing southern work clothes, textile, and women's wear industry.

We of Greenwood have great confidence that this is only the beginning of an era of prosperity for our community, because the company we have chosen—and which has chosen us—has an outstanding record of achievement and is headed by an outstanding American of unusual abilities and accomplishments.

The founder and president of Conmar Products Corp. is Alexander Konoff, a man who in the best American tradition came to this country a penniless immigrant boy with no formal education, and who today holds a doctorate in mechanical engineering and has built two multimillion-dollar manufacturing companies.

Mr. Konoff founded Conmar 21 years ago in 1933, in the midst of the depression, and in 5 years had established his company as second ranking in the slide fastener industry. Conmar's Greenwood plant, which will be completed next spring, will be its third factory. Conmar's new nonjamming slider, called Conmatic, which is so engineered that it will not snag or become stuck, is making zipper history.

Both my constituents and the management of Conmar have great plans for Greenwood's new factory. It is an ultramodern plant, which was designed to facilitate expansion as the fortunes of Conmar and Greenwood continue to grow hand in hand. Conmar's southern branch will provide the quickest possible service to the expanding southern apparel industry.

Mr. Konoff is a man of great sincerity. Before he would consider bringing his company's new plant to Greenwood, he invited leaders of the community 1,305 miles to Conmar's Newark, N. J., headquarters because he felt it only fair that they should see what kind of company they were inviting to their community.

He is a compassionate man who has never forgotten his early days of hunger and poverty and whose deep sense of responsibility for the welfare of his fellow men has resulted in the design of many

features for the comfort of his Greenwood employees in the new building.

I would like to read into the RECORD the address Mr. Konoff made to Gov. Hugh White, of Mississippi, Mayor Allen Saffold, and the citizens of Greenwood during the recent ceremonies connected with the ground breaking, because they symbolize the whole philosophy of this great, philanthropic, humanitarian American. His remarks follow:

I would like to take a moment to express my appreciation for the welcome you have given my associates—and myself.

When our customers moved to the South, we knew that we would soon follow them. Our search for a suitable location took us to many towns and cities but—from the time I first saw Greenwood I knew that Conmar belonged here. The friendly spirit of your community as reflected by your mayor—the members of the chamber of commerce—and all your citizens—appealed to me. You made us feel at home from the start and today's ceremonies are only a symbol. We have long since become a part of Greenwood, a town in which we want to live—and work—and build.

I am sure that Conmar will flourish in your southern soil as it has elsewhere. I am equally sure that Greenwood will continue to grow with us and that our association will be a long, happy, and prosperous one.

This is not the first time that I have participated in the creation of a new and successful enterprise. About 40 years ago I founded an industry that was entirely new in the United States—the manufacturing of moving eyes for dolls. Today our associate company, the Margon Corp., is the largest of its kind in the world, employing nearly 1,000 people in Bayonne, N. J.

About 20 years ago I established Conmar Products Corp. I recognized the need for developing the zipper which, at that time, was regarded as a mere novelty.

Today the zipper is a staple necessity. Billions of slide fasteners are used annually for clothing, leather goods, and a wide variety of other civilian and military articles. New uses for the zipper and improvements in the mechanism are constantly being introduced. As a result, the demand for zippers increases year after year. The technical know-how of our company is contributing to the continuing growth of the industry.

Our insistence on precision workmanship has made the name "Conmar" synonymous with the highest quality standards. These are some of the reasons why we are one of the leading producers in the country today.

Mayor Saffold and some members of the chamber of commerce have visited us in Newark and have seen—firsthand—our modern plant and its technically advanced equipment, which we designed and built. You will be pleased to know that our new plant here will be even more modern and will be equipped with our latest machinery.

My recent participation in the industrialization of the State of Israel is another example of my interest in new undertakings. I had the privilege of helping to organize two new companies, a textile concern and a plastics firm. Both organizations are already thriving and giving employment to many Israeli citizens. In the same manner, I trust we shall be pioneers in the industrialization of Greenwood.

Many people ask me why I continue to open new enterprises and why I don't take life easy instead. All my life I have worked hard and I pray that I will have the strength and the courage to continue to do so. I can find no better explanation of my feeling and no better answer to the questions of my friends—than the words of the great Eng-

lish philosopher, John Ruskin, who said: "When we build—let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is to come when those stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say, as they look upon the labor and the wrought substances of them: See, this our fathers did for us."

This is why it is a thrill for me to be here today and why I look forward with confidence to the growth of Conmar in Greenwood.

Thank you.

Average Man Benefits by Elimination of Waste From Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the national deficit for President Truman's last year in office was \$9,400,000,000. The national deficit for President Eisenhower's first year in office was \$3,029,000,000. In a brief 12 months President Eisenhower and an Eisenhower Congress brought the national budget over \$6 billion closer into balance. The apostles of doom and gloom said it could not be done, but it has been done.

How did President Eisenhower and his Congress accomplish this improved national financial condition? Did they do it by lessening or eliminating needed and desirable services to the people? No.

Needed and desirable public services to the people have not been decreased. Instead, desirable services to the people have been expanded.

For example, 50 million motorists want better and safer roads. This Congress has authorized the expenditure of \$300 million a year more money on Federal highway construction than ever was authorized by any previous Congress in any previous year.

Before Congress adjourns, social-security pensions will have been increased and more citizens given the protection of this wise law, thereby making life a little more enjoyable for the elder citizens.

Pensions and compensation have been increased by \$109 million to service-connected disabled war veterans and to the widows or the parents who lost their husband or son in any war due to death on the battlefield or from war-inflicted disease or wounds. The increase may not be as large as some wanted or expected, but it is \$109 million a year more than ever was granted heretofore.

Congress also has provided funds for the operation of 114,000 veterans' hospital beds, which is the largest number of VA hospital beds operated anytime in the history of the Nation.

The Congress has made available, during the coming year, an additional \$100

million of loan funds to help veterans acquire homes of their own.

The money for financing the rehabilitation of disabled citizens, veteran and nonveteran alike, to equip them to become employable and again self-supporting has been increased by 50 percent.

These better services to the people have cost additional hundreds of millions. Despite these added expenditures to provide this better service, the budget is nearing a balanced condition.

How did President Eisenhower and the Congress achieve this great record? They achieved it by keeping their election promise that they would eliminate waste and extravagance anywhere and everywhere they found it and thereby provide the taxpayer with better Government services at less cost.

President Eisenhower and this Congress have provided the Nation with more efficient and effective Government than our country has known in a long time. This Congress has demonstrated that the people can have better service from Government and lower taxes too.

The Betrayed Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I was nominated without opposition as the Democratic candidate for election to Congress from the 11th District of Missouri, for which I am honored and deeply grateful. The 11th Congressional District is generally regarded as a close district, and it would naturally be my desire to return to the district as soon as possible to conduct my campaign.

On the 2d day of next November the voters in our respective congressional districts will have their first opportunity to express their opinion of the Republican administration now in power and to also vote for or against their representation in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, although like every other Member in Congress, I am concerned with thoughts of my opponents now campaigning against me, it seems of far greater importance that every Member of Congress should remain here until the full discharge of our duties to the people we represent here in Congress. This is our solemn obligation and duty to the people back home and is of vastly greater importance than the early return home to engage in a campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time and opportunity of serving notice that I shall vote against any resolution for adjournment until Congress has had an opportunity to consider and vote on many important bills now pending, bottled up, and undisposed of. I sincerely hope the Republican majority leadership will provide such opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly refer to my bill, H. R. 10058, to provide emergency assistance and relief in the drought-

stricken areas of the United States, and for other purposes. This bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to provide emergency relief for the victims of the widespread drought presently existing in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1 billion, to be used in the discretion and under the direction of the President in—

(1) establishing a program for the purchase of beef and cattle in drought-stricken areas for distribution to schools, hospitals, and the Armed Forces with adequate provision to assure the farmers at least \$10 per 100 pounds for utility grade cattle;

(2) purchasing grains and feeds from the Commodity Credit Corporation for distribution in drought-stricken areas;

(3) establishing a program of 30-year loans to assist in drilling wells in areas where the water supply is exhausted; and

(4) providing such other forms of assistance as he may deem appropriate to combat the effects of the drought.

Mr. Speaker, if we are financially able to appropriate billions of dollars, as is now being done, for relief and assistance to the economy of foreign countries, then for the sake of America, why cannot we afford one of such billions as provided in my bill for our own taxpaying American citizens who so sorely need and deserve such assistance as never before, in the drought-stricken areas.

Mr. Speaker, in the August 1954 publication of the Missouri Farmer, there is an article entitled "Will Congress Legislate Nation Into a General Depression?" This article was written by Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association. Mr. Heinkel is closely associated with and among the best informed on the problems and needs of the farmers. He has a national reputation as a great leader of the farmers of America, and no person is more admired and highly respected for his integrity and ability than Fred V. Heinkel. This is what he says in the article published in the Missouri Farmer:

WILL CONGRESS LEGISLATE NATION INTO A GENERAL DEPRESSION?

(By Fred V. Heinkel, president, the Missouri Farmers Association)

The bitterest fight seen in Washington for a long time is that which has been occurring lately over the farm bill which passed the House a few days ago. And well might it be a bitter fight, for involved along with the political skins of numerous Representatives and Senators is the future standard of living for millions of rural people.

The big fight was begun at a time when net farm income was sharply declining. Farm prices had plunged downward 4 percent in June, dropping the parity ratio to 88 percent. Net farm income has declined 13 percent in the last 2 years, at the same time that other parts of the economy have been chalking up new income record highs. Income for farmers will suffer another cut of about 5 percent on 1954 crops, while as a result of cross-compliance, 1955 farm income is expected to drop as much as 15 percent overall. Some individual crops are likely to show even greater declines.

This is being written before the farm bill has been dealt with by the Senate. Because of disagreement between House and Senate, the chances are the final bill will be written by a conference committee of the House and Senate. It is too much to expect that a real good farm bill will be enacted into law, in

view of the House action and the weakness of farm sentiment in the Senate.

The House bill was weak enough when it started out. It was practically destroyed by the Harrison amendment, which was a compromise calculated to please the administration and make the bill acceptable to the President.

That this was accomplished was proven by the statement of President Eisenhower in which he hailed the House vote as a great victory for the administration. The victory was also hailed by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Farm Bureau Federation.

When the bill came on the House floor, the Farm Bureau deluged Congressmen with letters and telegrams urging them to establish flexible supports at from 75 to 90 percent of parity.

The administration, with the President himself taking part, really put the heat on Republican Members of the House to defeat the bill or at least modify it, as was done with the adoption of the Harrison amendment. As one writer in Washington stated it:

"A little band of only 23 Republicans, led by Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, stood fast against bone-crushing pressure exerted by the administration and its lobbying allies. Many other GOP Congressmen who had voted for 90 percent of parity in every previous test deserted in the July 2 rollcall.

One thing that happened was that some Republican Members from dairy States like Wisconsin were unable to agree upon a strong dairy provision, which left them with nothing to fight for at the showdown. In confusion, they finally voted largely with the low-price crowd. Most Midwest Republicans, including COLE, of St. Joseph; SHORT, of the 7th District; and HILLELSON, of the 4th District of Missouri, deserted the cause of parity under strong party pressure.

(Incidentally, the way party pressure is exerted is that if you don't stand hitched the party won't help you get reelected.)

The Democrats gave about the same backing to 90 percent of parity as they did in 1952.

Secretary Benson's campaign to turn city Congressmen against price supports was successful in many cases. Of 88 Democrats from city districts, 34 voted for the cut in supports. Every one of the 98 Republican Congressmen from city districts, including CURTIS, of St. Louis, voted for the cut in supports. Every one of the Missouri Democrats, including the city members, voted against the Harrison amendment and for 90 percent of parity.

If the Harrison amendment, which fixes supports at between 82½ to 90 percent of parity, is sustained by the Senate, and the bill is signed by the President, farm income will be cut another \$3 billion below the \$13 billion realized in 1952. Had the administration-Farm Bureau-chamber of commerce 75 percent of parity provision been sustained farm income would have suffered a slash down to \$7½ billion.

The United States Chamber of Commerce, while deploring the fact that 75 percent of parity was displaced by a low of 82½ percent in the House, termed the bill a "heartening victory"; and President Ike called it a "sweeping victory." Allen Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau, said, "The action of the House in voting to terminate the rigid 90 percent of parity price supports . . . was a good one."

Thus, as your farm income continues to decline, aside from the ravages of drought and grasshoppers, you will know whom to blame. I am proud that your MFA has fought every step of the way for higher farm income. Your officers would certainly have been derelict in their duty had they not done so. You will never see your Missouri Farmers Association advocating lower income for

farmers, or suggesting that any gains made by farmers be given away.

The farmers of America have been feeding the American people better and more cheaply than any other people on this earth have ever been fed at any time. I, for one, cannot see how we can keep on doing this much longer without receiving our just share of the national income. Unless the American people are willing that farmers receive a just return for their sweat and toil, then surely the time will come when they will be haunted by food shortages. Then they will look back on these times as the golden days of abundance when our biggest worry was huge surpluses of good things to eat.

There will be another Congress next year. Another farm bill can be passed at that time if Congress so wills. But Congress won't listen next year unless farmers and their wives register their sentiments at the polls in November. I suggest that the ballot box is the only recourse farmers have now. I think that on election day it will behoove farm people to remember their friends, as well as their enemies—and this regardless of political party.

Unless there is a radical change, totally unexpected by all observers on the Washington scene, the farm bill that comes out of this Congress will practically legislate a general depression. For general depressions are always preceded by a farm depression, and no one knows better than the farmer and his wife that a farm depression is here now.

It seems to be a favorite indoor sport of economists and certain politicians to sit in swivel chairs in air-conditioned offices and tell about how prosperous our country is at the present time. But farmers and their wives have been hit in their pocketbooks and hard; and the words of the ivory tower prognosticators are falling upon deaf ears throughout rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Missouri Democrats referred to in this article by Mr. Heinkel as voting against the Harrison amendment and for 90 percent of parity. I am proud of my consistent stand and fight for the farmers of America; they are the backbone and foundation of our great Nation. Without their prosperity, production, and purchasing power, grass would grow in the streets of the cities.

All Taxpayers Benefit Under New Republican Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, without attempting to give a technical interpretation of the provisions of the tax-revision bill, I am setting forth hereafter the salient features so that my constituents may know what this important legislation does for them personally. This is the first tax bill in more than 50 years, and the Republican 83d Congress has given the taxpayers of this country more tax relief than at any time in the history of our country.

DEPENDENTS

First. A parent can claim a deduction of \$600 for each child regardless of the

child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Second. A parent can also claim the \$600 dependency deduction for a child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Third. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of a family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family.

Fourth. A taxpayer can claim a \$600 dependency deduction for a foster child.

Fifth. A taxpayer can claim a \$600 dependency deduction for a child awaiting adoption.

Sixth. A taxpayer can claim a \$600 dependency deduction for any other person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

Seventh. A taxpayer can claim a \$600 dependency deduction for a cousin who is institutionalized because of physical or mental disability.

Savings to taxpayers, \$85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

First. Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to \$600 for the expense of child care for children up to 12 years of age.

Second. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

Third. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent, regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

Fourth. A similar deduction is allowed a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed \$5,100.

Savings to taxpayers, \$130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

First. Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under present law.

Second. Example: A family with \$3,000 gross income and medical expenses of \$150 will be able to deduct \$60. The same family can deduct nothing today.

Third. The bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

Savings to taxpayers, \$80 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

First. A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

Second. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother.

Savings to the taxpayers, \$11 million.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

First. All retired people 65 and over, including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, will in effect be exempt on all retirement income up to \$1,200. This will mean a tax reduc-

tion for these retired people of up to \$240 a year.

Second. Example: A retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of \$3,000 today pays about \$300 in income tax. Under the bill, his tax is reduced to \$60—a saving of \$240.

Third. The same exemption will extend to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public-retirement system, such as do teachers.

Savings to taxpayers, \$141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

This bill allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases.

Total saving to taxpayers, \$10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

This bill increases from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deduction for charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Total saving to taxpayers, \$25 million.

AID TO FARMERS

First. Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income are allowed for soil and water conservation.

Second. The bill permits more rapid writeoff of the expense of farm machinery, equipment, and construction.

Third. Removes tax on the proceeds of the sale of cattle when the sale is necessitated by disease.

Savings to taxpayers, \$10 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

First. Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans will not be taxable to their employees.

Second. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely exempted from tax.

Third. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempted up to \$100 a week.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

DEATH BENEFITS

The bill exempts all death benefits up to \$5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the \$1,200 exemption extended to retirement income, the bill also provides a simpler method for taxation of pensions and annuities, ends annual 3-percent tax paid on annuities, and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy.

Savings to taxpayers, \$10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

First. Excludes first \$50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance.

Second. Example: An individual with \$50 or less in dividends from his savings will be entirely exempt from tax on that amount.

Third. Example: An individual with \$250 in dividends from his savings will exclude the first \$50 entirely, and then

reduce his total tax by \$8—4 percent of the balance of \$200.

Savings to taxpayers, \$204 million.

DEPRECIATION

The bill will permit the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment, the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed.

Savings to taxpayers, \$375 million, of which \$75 million represents savings to individuals such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED TAX

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax. Upward of a million taxpayers be relieved of the present requirement for filing.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of March 15, giving taxpayers 1 additional month in which to prepare their final tax returns and make their final tax payments.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

The bill grants taxpayers an option to either deduct as an expense or to amortize research and experimental expenditures.

No revenue estimate possible. The provision is designed to encourage business research with the objective of creating new products, new processes, and new jobs.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

The bill brings tax accounting rules into harmony with business accounting, thereby eliminating to a great extent two sets of books. It provides realistic computation of net income for tax purposes in conformity with sound business practices.

Savings to taxpayers, \$47 million.

DEPLETION

The bill increases the rate of percentage depletion on a variety of critical and strategic minerals in order to encourage the development of domestic sources of supply.

Savings to taxpayers, \$34 million.

PARTNERSHIPS

First. The bill adopts comprehensive provisions concerning the tax treatment of partners and partnerships in order to remove confusion of existing law. Principal objectives are simplicity, flexibility, and equity between partners.

Second. Certain proprietorships and partnerships are given the option to be taxed as corporations.

Savings to taxpayers, \$20 million.

INVENTIONS

The bill extends capital-gains treatment to proceeds realized by an inventor on the sale or exchange of a patent.

No revenue estimate possible. The new provision is designed to encourage invention and thereby promote a healthy economy and an improving standard of living.

NET OPERATING LOSS

The bill extends the net operating loss carryback to 2 years and makes certain other adjustments.

Savings to taxpayers, \$120 million.

LIFE INSURANCE

The bill lessens the estate tax on the proceeds of certain life-insurance policies.

Savings to individual taxpayers, \$25 million.

CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

The bill removes the 2-percent penalty tax with respect to consolidated returns filed by regulated public utilities.

Savings to taxpayers, \$35 million.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATIONS

The bill eases the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses, may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes.

Savings to taxpayers, \$10 million.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX

The bill extends for 1 year the present 52 percent corporation income tax.

Total increase in revenue, \$1.2 billion.

REPUBLICAN ACTION FOR TAXPAYERS

The 10 percent reduction in Federal income taxes which went into effect last January 1 saves individual taxpayers a total of \$3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if the Congress and the administration had not cut the Truman budget for fiscal 1954 by \$12 billion.

Nor would the \$2 billion tax saving by elimination of the excess-profits tax have been possible without this budget cutting.

The Republican excise tax reduction law saves taxpayers an additional \$1 billion.

The Tax Revision Act will save taxpayers \$1,400,000,000.

A total of \$827 million of this tax saving is for individuals. The remainder, \$536 million, is tax relief for business.

The overall tax-cut program will save \$7,400,000,000. Of this amount, individuals receive an overall total tax saving of \$4,700,000,000. The tax savings so far surpass any previous total in the history of Congress.

Public Always Paid for Rackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shocking aspects of the recent investigations launched into FHA building negotiations and labor racketeering is the degree to which those who participated in these shenanigans accepted them as ordinary. Some of those questioned have become highly indignant at being examined. They have repeatedly insisted that these payoff deals, or substantial markups in land valuations and estimated costs of construction were taken for granted. To insure delivery of materials or to prevent work stoppages for any one of hundreds of possible reasons, business people from the

docks of New York across the Nation have paid off to so-called labor-business agents in routine fashion. In the FHA scandals, Government representatives quite obviously knew—perhaps even suggested—methods of enrichment for builders.

These practices invariably lead to one inevitable result. The public, the consumer, the taxpayers at large get stuck with the bill. FHA loans made to labor racketeers mean that the producer increases the costs of his product to cover his costs of operation. These things are morally wrong. They must not be permitted to go unchallenged, year after year, because they make dishonesty into a virtue and breed cynical disrespect for decency in our society.

United States Representative Harold C. Hagen Will Have Office in County Seat Towns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in line with a policy I established some years ago, it is my plan this year to set up temporary congressional offices in each of the 15 counties of the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota.

This will be done shortly after my return to Minnesota to reopen my official congressional office at Crookston, which is centrally located geographically in the district. My office there will be on the second floor of the post office building in Crookston, room 205.

My office staff, including my executive secretary, Earl McArthur, will be there daily to meet constituents and friends who may come into the office for a personal call or on some problem of an official nature. We are always ready and willing to be of every possible service and assistance to citizens of the district who may have matters to take up with the Federal Government. My Washington, D. C., office also remains open and the address there is 1405 New House Office Building. Office hours at both places are from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m.

I will be at the office at Crookston part of the time, but for the most part until November 2, election day, I will be traveling throughout the district campaigning for reelection to Congress.

We will establish a temporary office in the various counties and local citizens from throughout the area will have an opportunity to confer informally with their own Representative to the United States Congress, namely, myself, Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN. One or two members of my office staff will accompany me and assist me at these conferences and during the office hours which will be from 9 a. m. to 12 noon and 1:30 p. m. to 5 p. m. at each county seat. In other words, the office of the Ninth

District Congressman will be moved to each county seat in the Ninth District for 1 day.

At most of the county seats, my congressional office for the day designated for the county will be at the courthouse. In a few instances, at the city hall, or perhaps at the community building.

The schedule for each county follows:

Roseau County: Tuesday, September 28, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., county courthouse, Roseau.

Lake of the Woods County, September 29, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Baudette.

Beltrami County: Thursday, September 30, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., city hall, Bemidji.

Clearwater County: Friday, October 1, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Bagley.

Mahnomen County: Monday, October 4, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., county welfare office building, Mahnomen.

Norman County: Tuesday, October 5, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Ada.

Red Lake County: Wednesday, October 6, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Red Lake Falls.

Pennington County: Thursday, October 7, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., VFW Hall, 123 Horace Ave. North, Thief River Falls.

Kittson County: Tuesday, October 12, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Hallock.

Marshall County: Wednesday, October 13, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Warren.

Becker County: Friday, October 15, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Detroit Lakes.

Clay County: Tuesday, October 19, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Moorhead.

Otter Tail County: Wednesday and Thursday, October 20 and 21, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Fergus Falls.

Wilkin County: Friday, October 22, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Breckenridge.

Any changes in the location of the meeting place and office will be announced in the local newspapers and over the radio.

Everyone is welcome to come in to these temporary congressional offices in each county seat. No appointments are necessary for these conferences. You are invited to come in anytime to see me. Any or all of my constituents are urged to meet with me on the date and place convenient to them to discuss any problems on which my office staff and I may be of assistance and service, or you may want to come in to discuss some of the issues or perhaps stop in for just a social call.

I have long fought for and spoken loudly and strongly for 90 percent to 100 percent of parity on farm crops from the average small farm. I voted for 90 percent at all times. I wish you would come in and discuss the farm problem with me whether you agree with me or not.

We will serve coffee, milk, cookies, and doughnuts all day. I will be seeing you.

War Is Self-Defeating and Suicidal— American Defense Commitments Now Circle the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the world is still in a posture of paralyzed tension. Aggressive Soviet communism is proceeding on schedule. It is not satisfied with half a victory in southeast Asia and it is only a matter of months when it will control Laos, Cambodia, and possibly Thailand. The exit of the white man from Asia is written in large letters so all the world may see.

In our own country, Mr. Speaker, there is a demand by some people that we should seize the initiative and beat the Communists to the draw. This appeal is a seductive one but it is charged with a great responsibility and a considerable gamble.

What have three major wars in the last 35 years gained the free world—World War I, World War II, and Korea? Mr. George F. Kennan, a foreign affairs expert, said recently that "two world wars stand out today as tragic, colossal follies, from which no one has gained." "War," he says, "became self-defeating and suicidal." I agree with Mr. Kennan.

Today, Mr. Speaker, if another shooting war starts the United States will be in it without question. Our commitments circle the world.

I doubt that the American people fully realize that they are fully committed in writing to defend 694 million people and 21.5 million square miles of land in 39 nations on 6 continents and across 3 oceans. Yet there are only 161 million of us. As the U. S. News & World Report points out the United States is the military guardian of 29 percent of the world's population and 41 percent of its land area.

In addition to the above obligations, Mr. Speaker, we have mutual security and mutual defense assistance agreements with 25 other nations. These agreements do not bind us to go to war, it is true, but they imply a strong moral obligation to do so.

Thus, in effect, Mr. Speaker, the United States has undertaken to defend a total of 64 nations, of 28.3 million square miles, and with 1.5 billion people, or a total of 54 percent of the world's land area and 61 percent of its population. No mention is made here of the unknown obligations under the charter of the United Nations.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, the United States with a population of about 161 million people and 3½ million square miles has obligated itself in writing to defend 694 million people over an area comprising 21½ million square miles. This is a gigantic task, and the American people must be fully informed about it.

Therein, Mr. Speaker, is the very great possibility that somehow in some way, a self-defeating and suicidal war might again engulf us.

Also contained therein is the possibility for economic collapse of the United States. Neither the human nor economic resources of this country are endless. There is a limit beyond which we cannot go. The time has come for that appraisal which was promised some months ago.

My Report to the Railway and Other Workers in the Ninth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in the 15 counties of northwestern Minnesota, comprising the Ninth Congressional District, there are many fine men and women engaged in railroad work. We have division points at places like Dilworth, Thief River Falls, Breckenridge, East Grand Forks, and other places in the district.

I am proud to say that, in past elections, I have been endorsed by most of the railroad organizations upon my record in their behalf.

I can recall that in 1947 the so-called Jennings bill was before the House. This bill was strictly a railroad law and provided that if a railroad employee was injured or a passenger was injured, or there was a freight claim, that the lawsuit must be brought in the county or Federal district where the accident occurred. I do not need to go into detail on this except to say that every labor organization of railroad men bitterly opposed this railroad-sponsored bill and I was able to line up many votes against it.

I always have supported liberalization of the railroad retirement law, and just a few months ago we passed a law raising average payments by \$24 a month.

We also brought 10 million more persons under social security and liberalized that law so that it will benefit every person when they reach the age of 65 and raised their benefits materially. In 1947, when the Taft-Hartley labor law was passed, I was one of 113 Members out of 435 who voted to recommit that law to committee. I felt then, and I feel now, that the law needed many amendments in order to make it more fair to the workers, employers, and the public.

However, I voted for final passage of the Taft-Hartley law because it had the following good points:

In the first place, it required that officials of the unions should file with the Government sworn statements that they were not Communists. This has done a great deal to check and stop the rule of a few unions by men and women who would destroy America. The Taft-Hartley law also provides that the huge amounts of money collected in dues and

initiation fees should be accounted for to the members of the unions. Previously, some of the officials of some unions made a racket and also made themselves hundreds of thousands of dollars because they did not have to account for funds.

The Taft-Hartley law also provided that union officials should be elected with a secret ballot. Previously, a few labor bosses perpetuated themselves in to office through tricky phrases in their constitutions. The Taft-Hartley law also provided that when a strike threatens the Nation the President could declare an emergency and delay a strike for 80 days. Previously, John L. Lewis, or labor leaders of that type, could paralyze the Nation with a suddenly called strike.

The Taft-Hartley law permits unions to sue bosses who break their contracts and permits companies to sue unions which break their contracts.

The Taft-Hartley law outlaws the closed shop. That means that a worker could not get a job unless he belonged to the union, which meant that a few labor bosses were doing hiring for companies which had their money invested in business. Under the Taft-Hartley law the union shop is legalized, which means that a worker, not a union member, can be hired, but must join the union within 30 days after going to work if that union is the bargaining agent.

Previously, unions forced employers to check off union dues, but under the Taft-Hartley law, this now could be done only with the consent of the jobholder.

Previously, some labor bosses took millions of dollars of union dues and put it into political campaign funds to elect radicals, and in some cases Communists, to office.

All corporations are forbidden by law to make political campaign contributions and the Taft-Hartley law prevents unions from taking their union dues and using it for political purposes.

However, any individual worker may make a voluntary contribution to campaigns.

I wanted this law amended to make it more fair but because of its good features, I supported it on final passage.

My thought that it should be amended has long since been approved because Senator Taft himself piloted through the Senate 27 amendments to the law, which were stalled by House Democrats who wanted to make it an issue. And President Eisenhower also recommended certain changes, but the Democrats of the Senate killed the bill for the 1954 session.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, with the depression theme played out, what will the Dems sing in November?

A Report to the People on the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the past 8 years, I have had the honor of representing the people of the nine counties of southwest Washington in the Congress of the United States. I am grateful to those who, by their votes, have enabled me to have the interesting experience of being Congressman.

This is my report to these people, whose employee I am, on what Congress did and did not do in the 2 years since my last election.

Some politicians for selfish reasons are apt to call the present Republican Congress "a do-nothing Congress." For the same selfish reasons other politicians are likely to describe the present Congress "the best Congress ever." Put down both statements as being biased and prejudiced. The Congress has been neither totally bad nor 100 percent perfect. It has left undone some things it should have done. On the other hand, this Congress has enacted many progressive, forwardlooking, constructive and wise laws that will be of benefit to the citizens of the Nation.

The people of my district are my employers. I, the Congressman, am their employee. What these people, my employers, want from me, their employee, I think, is a factual account of what the Congress did or did not do during the past 2 years. In short, they want the facts. Once the people have the facts, they will make up their own minds as to the Congress and also as to whether I, their Congressman, have done a good job or a poor one.

Here are some of the important things this Congress did and what it left undone:

Congress enacted the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, which every President from Coolidge to Eisenhower has recommended but which, heretofore, always has failed of passage. Congress did not, however, vote to grant statehood to Alaska or Hawaii, although recent Presidents of both parties have recommended statehood for both. I, always, since coming to Congress, have supported the St. Lawrence project and statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Because of my active support of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, I was one of about 20 Senators and Representatives invited by President Eisenhower to be present at the White House when he signed the St. Lawrence bill into law.

THE GREATEST ACHIEVEMENTS

The greatest achievements of the first 18 months of the Eisenhower administration, of course, was the ending of the Korean war and the keeping of our Nation's young men out of bloody involvement in the Indochina mess. This resulted from actions by President Eisen-

hower. He, and he alone, is entitled to all the credit for stopping the Korean war and preventing our involvement in Indochina.

When General Eisenhower went to Korea to make a personal inspection of the situation there, his opposition called his Korean trip "politics." They charged his motive was to make votes, not to make peace. They, loudly, predicted the Eisenhower Korean trip would accomplish nothing and would end in failure.

The opposition turned out to be false prophets. Despite their predictions that he would do nothing, President Eisenhower promptly ended the Korean war. The weekly casualty lists bearing the names of 500 to 1,000 American boys who had been killed or wounded in action stopped. American mothers, fathers, wives, and sweethearts breathed prayers of praise and gratitude to President Ike.

Some of the opposition breathed no such prayers. They said the Korean peace meant nothing, that it would not last. The answer to that is that it has lasted now for more than a year.

Lately, some of Eisenhower's opposition have been claiming that the President and Congress would get involved in war in Indochina. They have not and they are not going to get involved.

Perhaps, someone else in the White House might have done just as well as President Eisenhower in getting our Nation out of one war and keeping it from involvement in another. On the other hand, someone else in the White House might have done worse. Certain it is, however, that no President could have done better than Ike in keeping the Nation at peace, for we are at peace.

EISENHOWER DEPRESSION EUG-A-BOO

When Eisenhower ended the Korean war, while his opponents still were shouting it could not be done, this opposition had to take up a new line of attack on the President and upon Congress.

There had been a slight decline in business and employment after the ending of the Korean war. The Eisenhower opposition hailed this decline as a sure sign that the Nation was going into a great Eisenhower depression. Had the American people been less well educated than they are, they might have been scared into panic by the dire predictions of these apostles of gloom and doom. The American people knew, however, that every modern war has been followed by a slowdown as industry switched over from wartime to peacetime production. Some layoffs during the postwar period of adjustment were inevitable.

The people with calmness and courage took the changeover period from war to peace production after Korea in stride. Soon business and employment were on the upgrade again. The so-called Eisenhower recession just did not materialize as Ike's opponents said it would. Today, the Nation looks forward on brighter and better prospects for a long period of prosperity—a prosperity based upon peace not upon war and killing.

Ike's opposition gloom peddlers who 6 months ago were shouting "depression," "depression," from the housetops, over every radio set and from the halls of Congress are silent on this subject now.

They want the people to forget they ever made such false prophet predictions.

WASTEFUL SPENDING SLASHED

President Eisenhower and the Congress from the very start of the new administration began eliminating wasteful and extravagant Federal Government spending wherever it was found. President Eisenhower, himself, set the example for eliminating extravagance by ordering the presidential yacht *Williamsburg*, laid up.

The *Williamsburg*, for many years, has been kept in instant readiness for any weekend cruise on the Potomac that a President might want to take. Cost to the taxpayers of operating this only occasionally used palatial presidential yacht was \$600,000 a year. Ike said, "lay it up." Then he advised his Cabinet members to go and likewise wipe out extravagance wherever found.

Car pools were instituted to lessen the overly large and careless use of the 260,000 automobiles bought and owned by the Government for the use of Federal employees. Under the old wasteful system, every tenth Government worker had a car assigned to him for his own special use. Under the car-pool system much of the waste will be eliminated. The Government will save, it is estimated, \$180 million that formerly went for the purchase, depreciation, operation, and maintenance of this needlessly and excessively large number of cars.

Better methods were put into effect throughout the Government. Red tape and duplication were lessened and in many instances eliminated. Where two persons held political jobs to do the work one should do, the payrolls were trimmed.

Enormous sums were saved for the taxpayers. The total savings accomplished by President Eisenhower and the Congress are enormous.

In a brief period of 17 months President Eisenhower and Congress cut \$14 billion from the Truman rate of spending.

Whereas President Truman, just before leaving office, had predicted a \$10 billion deficit for the coming year, President Eisenhower cut this deficit to \$3,029,000,000, or by about \$7 billion under what President Truman had predicted that deficit would be.

This, however, was not all. Eisenhower and Congress at the same time also reduced taxes by more than \$7 billion, including the removal of \$1 billion in excise taxes on theater tickets; bicycles; sporting goods; toilet articles; bus, train, and airplane tickets; jewelry; films; light bulbs, and many other things all consumers buy.

Other tax benefits granted included greater deductions from income taxes for money paid on doctors, medical, and dental bills. Also, allowed by this Congress was an extra \$1,200 exemption from taxation of money received in pensions. This exemption of pension receipts benefits retired teachers, policemen, city firemen, and all who draw pensions of any kind from either public or private sources.

MANY SERVICES EXPANDED

When the Congress began cutting spending by the elimination of waste

and extravagance, the opposition said necessary Government services to the people would be eliminated or reduced.

Has the cutting of Federal wasteful spending reduced worthwhile Federal services? No. On the contrary, Congress during the past year enacted many laws increasing beneficial services to the people.

For example, Congress this year authorized the spending of \$300 million a year more on highway construction than was ever spent in any year during any previous administration. As a result of this expanded highway building program, 13 to 20 million more dollars will be spent during the next 2 years on Washington State highways than was expended on them during the past 2 years. This means better and safer highways for the motorist. It means, also, more jobs for construction workers and thereby a stimulation of general business and employment.

The wages and salaries of Federal workers, including postal employees, have not been lowered by increased efficiency and elimination of waste. On the contrary, Congress increased the wages and salaries of Federal workers.

The benefits to millions drawing social security will be increased this fall due to laws passed by this Congress. Even the opposition admits the new social-security law is the best pension law the Nation ever has had.

Retired railroad workers and the widows and orphan children of railroad workers had their pensions increased and liberalized.

The pensions and compensation paid disabled veterans and the widows and orphans of war veterans also were increased by 5 percent.

Federal Government loans available to war veterans for buying or building homes were increased to \$150 million. Heretofore, such loans have been limited to \$100 million a year. This loan liberalization not only will aid veterans to acquire homes, it will, also, stimulate increased home building while in turn will aid the forest product industries and their workers.

Appropriations granted by this Congress are sufficient to operate 103,000 beds in veterans' hospitals, the greatest number ever operated.

Funds for the rehabilitation of disabled persons whether veterans or civilians were increased by 50 percent.

These increases in wages, salaries, and in pension payments to those drawing social security, railroad retirement, or veterans' benefits will cost more than a billion dollars a year. This billion dollars spent for increased benefits to the people plus the \$7 billion tax reduction could not have been given if greater efficiency and economy through the elimination of waste and extravagance had not been attained.

Could anyone have imagined 18 months ago that the first 18 months of the Eisenhower administration would bring this billion dollars increase in services, a tax reduction of seven billions and the budget, at the same time, \$7 billion closer to being in balance? Certainly, these were colossal achievements.

MORE HOME BUILDING

This Congress enacted a law that makes credit for home buying easier. This law lowers down payments for those wishing to buy or build a home. It gives buyers longer time to repay loans. It makes the monthly purchase payments smaller. All of these benefits, granted by the present Congress, have made home building and home ownership easier.

These easier loans benefit the family that wants a home. Also, the easier payments will stimulate more building of homes. That, in turn, means more buying of lumber, plywood, shingles, and other building materials, and should insure high production and full employment in the industries producing those materials for several years to come.

During the first year of the Eisenhower administration there were more homes built in the United States than in any year in the Nation's history. Records already made in the present year indicate that the present year will see as many or even more home building starts as in the first year of Eisenhower's administration which was the Nation's best year ever for new housing starts.

With loans now liberalized by the present Congress, several good years of home building lie ahead. A good home building year, normally, is a good year for all forest product industries and their employees.

MORE DAM BUILDING

The Flood Control Committee of which I am chairman approved an authorization of \$180 million for power dam building on the Columbia River during the coming 2 years. This huge sum insures, the United States Army engineers testified before my committee, that the Columbia River dams now building can be kept on schedule.

The \$180 million includes \$3.6 million for surveys and \$3 million for a start on a new Columbia power dam. The engineers would not say what new dam will be started but they indicated that the new dam start would be either Libby or John Day. These dams, both, are huge undertakings and the building of either would add tremendously to Columbia River power production.

We need a new dam start to insure electric energy expansion after 1960 and the \$3.6 million for surveys and \$3 million which I, as flood control chairman, got into this bill for new constructions, will help get that new start.

The Congress has passed this bill which came out of my committee. As chairman of the subcommittee which handles many of the items in the bill, I played an important part in getting it adopted by the House.

This same bill includes an item for deepening the entrance channel to the Columbia River to 45 feet, a project which will cost \$8.5 million and be of great help to the seaports of Longview and Vancouver as well as providing much work for residents of the towns of Chinook, Ilwaco, Ocean Park, Long Beach, Seaview, Nahcotta, and Oysterville near where the \$8 million construction job will be undertaken.

The bill further includes some river and harbor improvement work on Grays Harbor and Willapa Harbor.

MONEY FOR TIMBER ROADS

I was fortunate in being able to obtain from Congress increased funds that will be available for processing timber sales and building access roads into timbered areas where Federal timber is being damaged by disease or bugs.

These added appropriations should prove most helpful in Eastern Lewis, Cowlitz, Clark, and Skamania Counties where bugs are doing enormous damage to timber in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. The problem is to get this timber out quickly before it is all lost through rot.

While these are troublesome times, mainly due to the attitude of Russian leaders, the present outlook for the United States is the best it has been in many years.

Our Nation is not at war. We have a strong leader in the White House whose abilities the Russian dictators know and respect. The Russians, knowing President Eisenhower's capacities, are loath to mix with America while such an able and experienced leader is President. This has improved our prospects for peace.

Also, the policies adopted by this Congress are, in the main, sound and reassuring, as is indicated by the fact that the switch over from a war to a peace economy after Korea was accomplished with a minimum of slowdown dislocation of the economy. Also, that dislocation was the shortest lived in history.

I expect to spend about 100 days in the district, staying there until about Christmas. During my stay at home, I hope to meet just as many of my constituents as possible and to be as helpful as I can to each in helping him solve any government problem he may have.

My office in Washington, D. C., will remain open, in competent hands, for the use of those having problems in the Capital. Also, I shall have an office in the Aberdeen First Federal Saving & Loan Building where I can be reached by those wishing to see me on any matter.

Highways and Skyways Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, some comedians are semiseriously suggesting that by the time we complete the road-building program, we should have to meet our automobile needs, highways may be obsolete and our people will be using skyways instead. This view may be prompted by the slowness with which our highway needs are being met in many parts of the country today. Two-lane roads which were constructed more than 30 years ago are still in use, sometimes as main traffic arteries between

large communities. Turnpike construction, speeded up in many parts of the country, is still available in only relatively few areas by contrast with increasing traffic demands.

President Eisenhower's proposal that the Nation ought to plan on a \$50 billion highway development in the next 10 years is realistic approach with everything to commend it. From the viewpoint of civilian traffic, every motorist understands the personal satisfaction of traveling safely and reasonably rapidly over six-lane highways, and the frustration of crawling home at peak hours over incredibly slow-moving clogged roads. This factor is only one element of the total picture. Military needs, preparation for any eventuality, certainly dictate prompt action and the expansion of cities into suburban areas which has been proceeding at an amazing rate everywhere makes the job mandatory. Americans like to do what has to be done quickly and efficiently. Now is the time for highways. Skyways will take care of themselves a little later.

Fight for Full Parity Must Continue— Hagen Speaks Up for 90 to 100 Percent Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, some of my Democratic Farmer-Labor opponents in this 1954 congressional race are misrepresenting to the men and women of the Ninth District the position of HAROLD C. HAGEN on various issues and problems—and particularly with regard to the farm program.

They are falsely telling them that I was not for 90 percent parity for farm products. They complain and criticize. They are just now talking 90 percent.

But United States Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN has been advocating, fighting for, and speaking up for full parity for 20 years. He has made dozens of talks to business groups, Rotary Clubs, Lions' Clubs, civic and commerce groups, women's clubs, as well as farm groups explaining why full parity is justified and necessary. None of my now critical DFL opponents have a record of this kind. In fact, they are only newcomers in this fight for parity of any kind. Furthermore, Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic Party leader, gives them no support on 90 to 100 percent parity.

I think virtually every voter in the Ninth District received my campaign newspaper for 1952, the Ninth District Congressional Gazette. On the front page in large type, three columns wide, is this headline: "HAGEN Asks 100 Percent Farm Price Parity."

Further down under this headline are these words:

HAGEN is fully aware of the fact that a healthy and prosperous agriculture means

a prosperous economy and is in the best interests of all our citizens.

Bankrupt farmers and prosperity simply do not go together. What the farmers need and want is 100-percent parity for farm production and less bureaucratic meddling.

I have been in the House of Representatives, representing you, since the election of 1942. In each campaign I have issued a newspaper, sent to all the homes in my district, and in every instance, I have advocated full parity of 100 percent for the farmers of my district, my State, and the whole Nation. And, of course, we must accept some less and reduced acreage if and when the crop production is high, but this reduction should be greater for the big farmers and less for the small family-size farmer. In other words let us give the small farmer a chance to make a decent living.

During the campaign you will receive another campaign newspaper, issued by my volunteer committee, with photographs and proof of the headlines from my previous campaign papers, and with facts and references exposing any opponent who deliberately may present falsehoods to you when they try to misrepresent my stand on agriculture. Furthermore, contrary to political gossip or newspaper stories, I have never missed a rollcall in the House on a farm-parity vote or issue.

The Ninth Congressional District is composed of 15 counties in the northwestern portion of Minnesota and is mostly a farming region, called many years ago the breadbasket of the world.

Every druggist, gas-station operator, storekeeper, tailor, doctor, lawyer, worker, newspaperman—in fact almost every person in these 15 counties is absolutely and directly dependent upon the farmer and on agriculture for his or her living. There can be no argument or question about this. Every one of you realize that if all the land in the 15 counties of the Ninth Minnesota Congressional District tomorrow turned to dry white sand, and so could not produce forestry products, food, fiber, meat, and other agricultural products, that every village and city in those 15 counties would be a hollow shell. The district would be full of ghost towns within a few months.

My record on all legislation and laws pertaining to agriculture is an open book, of which I am proud.

Not only have I always voted for 90 percent and even higher supports and spoke up for any law, bill, or proposal which would help agriculture, thus benefiting everybody in the Ninth District, but I have been a leader in writing many of these laws and pressing for their passage in my 12 years as your United States Representative in Congress. I have introduced several important farm legislative proposals and many have been approved.

ALWAYS SUPPORTED REA

This also is true in the case of the programs for rural electrification of farms and telephones for rural areas. When I was a comparative youngster on my grandfather's farm in Pennington County and on my Uncle Jacob Brovold's farm in Johnson Township in Polk

County, only 2 or 3 percent of the farms in northwestern Minnesota were electrified. Today, due to the REA, which I have enthusiastically supported in all my public life, the wives of most farmers do much of their work with electricity and the men of the farms are able to produce far more food with far less help than in the olden days of hand labor.

I am proud of my record on REA, and for the rural telephone program, and I will never be satisfied until every farm in these 15 northwest Minnesota counties have electricity and telephone service, provided the farmer and his wife want those services. I have always voted for and spoken up for these programs which should be expanded.

As the farm and REA leaders well know, I have always supported the preference clause in the Federal power policy and program. I have fought for and often spoke for the appropriations necessary to build high transmission lines into Minnesota from Missouri River dams so Minnesota people can get more low-cost electricity and power.

When my opponents attack our record in this Congress, let them explain how we reduced taxes by \$7,400,000,000 this year, the largest tax cut the American people ever enjoyed in a single year.

Your individual income taxes were reduced by about 10 percent beginning January 1, 1954, the first tax cut since the Republican 80th Congress of 1947-48. I voted to slash Government spending by billions of dollars, and the present administration's budget was \$10 billion—ten thousand million dollars—under the Truman budget.

I am very proud that, in this new tax reform bill, I was a coauthor of some of the provisions and amendments which greatly benefited every farmer in my district.

Under this new tax law farmers can claim the \$600 dependency deduction for a child, regardless of the child's earnings, if such dependent is receiving on-the-farm training and the farmer continues to furnish more than one-half of his support.

This new tax law also allows farmers deductions up to 25 percent of farm income for soil and water conservation and flood-control expenses, even though it may be an assessment payable to a conservancy district or some other civil unit, agency, or association. I was the author of this provision, and I fought it through the Congress to adoption.

More rapid writeoff of the cost of new depreciable assets is given on farm machinery, equipment, and so forth. Under the declining-balance method of depreciation now permitted, the farmer can write off in the first year twice the amount allowed under the straight-line method. Another benefit is the removal of the tax on proceeds from sale of cattle, when the sale is necessitated by disease, provided the proceeds are reinvested in cattle within 1 year after the closing of the taxable year.

Previously, where a farmer did not file a declaration of estimated tax by January 15, he had to file his final income-tax return by January 31. This deadline is now extended to February 15

and his final return is now not due until April 15.

Farmers' accounting requirements have been eased to permit the use of the farmer-preferred hybrid bookkeeping system.

Another law I voted for provided for rapid amortization of farm grain-storage facilities, whereas before, such facilities could be amortized only over their useful life. This now can be done over a 5-year period.

OPPOSED DAIRY-SUPPORT CUT

I have disagreed very strongly with Secretary of Agriculture Benson over his slash to 75 percent of parity for the dairy products of my district.

It is my firm belief that while the price of what the farmer buys, especially machinery, fertilizer, repairs and other products containing steel, continues to rise, and the price of what the farmer sells continues to drop, that we are going to have lots of trouble in the farm belt. This trend must be reversed, and something will have to be done in the next Congress.

I did everything in my power to stop this drastic slash to the farmers, but many of the city-machine Democrats of the North and some other Democrats and Republicans who believed wrongfully that the farmer gets a major portion of what the consumer pays for food, were largely responsible for sliding through Congress the 82½- to 90-percent parity amendment.

But, in justice to the present Republican administration, it should be remembered that from February 1951, to January 1953, the farm price average dropped 17 percent. Since January 1953, when Eisenhower took office, the drop has been less than 8 percent. The drop was more than twice as much during the Democratic administration.

WOOL PARITY 90 PERCENT

There are a number of wool producers in the Ninth Congressional District and I am happy to say that I supported, and it now is law, 90-percent parity on wool.

Congress decided to vote this support for woolgrowers because of the reciprocal trade treaty laws, strongly supported by Democrats over the years. These laws have often harmed Minnesota agriculture.

This law first was passed in 1934 and provided that the Secretary of State can make treaties with other nations cutting our tariffs as much as 50 percent—later 75 percent—without any protection to the farmer, and little to the industries of America.

Because of treaties signed under this Democratic law—wool shipments from Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and other nations—paralyzed the wool market for domestic producers. Canadians still ship barley, wheat, oats, and other grains into Minnesota and this lowers our markets.

In the Orient, the workers are paid from 30 to 80 cents a day in American values, and shiploads of coconut, palm, and cottonseed oils have come into these United States produced by that cheap labor.

Also butter, cheese, meat, and other farm products have come from nations where the scale of wages for workers is about one-third of what Americans receive.

I could mention many instances where American agriculture and American industry have been hard hit by the cheap labor products of various nations. For example, in Japan the average wage for a worker who produces cotton cloth is 13 cents an hour, and in India it is 9 cents an hour. This is only one striking illustration of the DFL ideas of reciprocal trade. It was not until 1947, when the Republicans had control of Congress, that amendments were made to the reciprocal trade treaty law, which provided that, when American industries were being destroyed, the Tariff Commission could recommend to the President that these low tariff rates be suspended. Generally, the Democrats opposed this so-called peril-point amendment.

If anyone desires further information on any problem not mentioned in this message, just drop me a card or a letter. My address is: United States Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN, 205 Post Office Building, Crookston, Minn.

My office there is open daily when Congress is not in session and you are invited to come in to see me at any time.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1954, the President approved House Joint Resolution 243, to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, by inserting the words "under God" after the word "Nation." This resolution had been unanimously adopted by both the House and the Senate and became Public Law 396 of the 83d Congress. The law now reads as follows:

SEC. 7. The following is designated as the pledge of allegiance to the flag: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." Such pledge should be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute.

Throughout the ages, the greatest blessings of life have come to mankind "under God." The inclusion of these words in our oath of allegiance has added a sacredness which makes our pledge even more inspiring. Our success as a Nation is due to our recognition of

God, our faith in that divine source of strength, and our dependence upon Him for guidance.

As we pledge our allegiance to the flag "under God," we proclaim the dedication of our Nation and its people to the Almighty. Let us always remember that devotion to God by this and all other nations of the free world will ultimately mean victory and security against the forces of evil which deny God.

Mr. Speaker, because I have received many inquiries from my district regarding the present wording of the pledge of allegiance, I am inserting it in the Record at this point, so that I may have reprints made at my own expense and make it available to residents of my congressional district.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, July 2, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Russell Cartwright Stroup, D. D., minister of the Georgetown Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, bless, we beseech Thee, the Senate of the United States in the closing days of this session. After long months of labor, bodies are worn and minds are weary, and still there remains so much for tired men to do. So grant to all Members a special measure of Thy mercy that they may have calm and tranquil spirits in the midst of tension and turmoil. Let quietness and confidence be their strength to the end that their work may move speedily to a successful conclusion with honor to this body and blessings to our country.

Finally, our Father, may all who have fought a good fight find for their reward the abiding satisfaction of those who labor well for what is worthy in Thy sight. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 3, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On August 2, 1954:

S. 587. An act for the relief of Carlos Fortich, Jr.; and

S. 2381. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of oil and gas on the public domain.

Red China's Formosa Line and Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the United States under Democratic foreign policy suggested that it did not regard the western reaches of the Pacific as part of our concern. Historians will some day determine whether or not this attitude gave rise to the Korean war, but it will not be necessary to wait for history to realize that this position did not deter

the North Koreans or the Red Chinese from invading South Korea.

We are about to witness a demonstration of the effect of our new State Department pronouncements on Formosa on the same aggressor. Secretary of State Dulles and President Eisenhower have left nothing unspoken in their determined stand on Formosa. We are prepared to prevent this island from falling into the hands of the Reds, if it means active military intervention. The Red Chinese have said nothing further about their announced intention to seize Formosa since Uncle Sam stated his position. We mean business, and if the Chinese of Chou En-lai think that we are bluffing, they are as wrong in their estimate of our position as Acheson was in his estimate of theirs in 1949.

On August 3, 1954:

S. 2759. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and otherwise improve the provisions of that act, and for other purposes;

S. 3466. An act to provide for two additional Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively; and

S. 3518. An act to amend the laws relating to fees charged for services rendered by the office of the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia and the laws relating to appointment of personnel in such office, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1748. An act to incorporate the National Fund for Medical Education;

S. 2746. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes and bands of Indians located in western Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3239. An act to authorize conveyance of land to the State of California for an inspection station;

S. 3302. An act granting to the Las Vegas Valley water district, a public corporation organized under the laws of the State of Nevada, certain public lands of the United States in the State of Nevada;

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton; and

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to establish the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 22. An act to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period;

S. 3532. An act to provide for the partition and distribution of the assets of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah between the mixed-blood

and full-blood members thereof; and for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the mixed-blood members of said tribe; to provide a development program for the full-blood members of said tribe; and for other purposes;

S. 2744. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Indians of Texas, and the individual members thereof; and for other purposes; and

S. 2745. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1254. An act to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands;

H. R. 2233. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2843. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the irrigation and reclamation resources of the Waimanalo, Oahu, Waimea, Island of Hawaii; and Mokolai projects, Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 5183. An act for the relief of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick, County, Kans.;

H. R. 5301. An act to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects;

H. R. 5499. An act to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats project for irrigation in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 5718. An act to limit the period for collection by the United States of compensation received by officers and employees in violation of the dual compensation laws;

H. R. 6616. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 7290. An act to authorize an appropriation for the construction of certain public-school facilities on the Klamath Indian Reservation at Chiloquin, Oreg.;

H. R. 7326. An act to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

H. R. 7334. An act to authorize certain property transactions in Coccol, C. Z., and for other purposes;